FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Supplement

Soviet Union

Regional Affairs

FBIS-SOV-90-243-S
Tuesday
18 December 1990

Soviet Union
SUPPLEMENT
Regional Affairs

FBIS-SOV-90-243-S *18 December 1990*

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

Estonia

Western Trade Unions Offer Estonia Food Aid *[TASS]* 1
Estonia's Meri Comments on Swedish Visit *[Tallinn Radio]* 1
Godmanis, Jurkans Attend Conference in Tallinn *[Riga Radio]* 1
Military Reported Equipping Estonian TV, Radio *[Vilnius International]* 1
Communist Party's Current State Viewed *[PRAVDA 7 Dec]* 2
Press Criticisms of Estonian Government Detailed *[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA 13 Nov]* 4
Call for New Estonian Government Published *[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA 6 Nov]* 5
Allik Discusses Call for New Estonian Government *[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA 16 Nov]* 6
Sillari Addresses Estonian Party Plenum *[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA 7 Nov]* 7
Estonia Not To Coordinate Plans With Moscow *[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA 9 Nov]* 13
Presidential Candidate on Independence Efforts *[Hamburg DIE WELT 3 Dec]* 13
Estonian Party Property Conflict Continues *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 1 Dec]* 14
Letter to Gorbachev Decries Center's Viewpoint *[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA 20 Nov]* 14
Non-Estonians Oppose Tallinn Housing Law Reforms 15
Restrictions Protested *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 8 Dec]* 15
Ethnic Differences Examined *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 9 Dec]* 18
Enterprise Representatives Support Union Treaty *[Moscow Radio]* 19
Living Standards Decline in Estonia *[TASS]* 20
New Estonian Media Workers' Union Founded *[TASS]* 20
Chairman Elected *[Tallinn TV]* 20
Strike Committee Supports Tallinn Garrison *[TASS]* 20

Latvia

Gorbunovs, Godmanis Cited on Talks With Russians *[IZVESTIYA 25 Nov]* 21
Latvian CP Congress Report, Debate Outlined 21
Congress Assessed *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 6 Dec]* 23
Ivashko Chairs Meeting With Latvian Communists *[TASS]* 25
Clash Over CP Premises Reflects Latvia Tensions *[PRAVDA 17 Nov]* 25
Rubiks Interviewed on Presidential Rule *[Riga Radio]* 25
CPSU Role in Latvian Republic Viewed *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 27 Nov]* 27
Legal Battle Over Enterprises Continues *[TASS]* 28
Law on 'Permanent Resident' Status Considered *[IZVESTIYA 7 Dec]* 28
Salvation Committee on Human Rights 'Violations' *[TASS]* 29
Latvian Mockery of State Symbols Assailed *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 13 Dec]* 29
Procuracy Denounces People's Front 'Challenge' *[TASS]* 30
People's Front Campaigns Against Union Treaty *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 4 Dec]* 31
Latvian Front Urges Deputy's Resignation *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 11 Dec]* 31
Latvian Deputy Criticizes Popular Front Tendencies *[Moscow TV]* 31
Latvia Said 'Not Capable' of Guarding Border *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 21 Nov]* 32
Latvian Citizens' Committee Changes Name *[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 1 Dec]* 33
Agricultural Workers Union Congress Opens *[TASS]* 33
Fascist 'Secret Service' Exposed in Latvia *[PRAVDA 28 Nov]* 34
Explosions Destroy Latvian 'Fascist' Monuments *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 12 Dec]* 35
Latvian Government Sponsors New Newspaper *[TASS]* 36
CP-Appointed Press House Director Not Recognized *[Riga Radio]* 36

Lithuania

Prunskiene Finnish Visit Continues 13 Dec *[Vilnius International]* 36
Legislative Delegation Visits France *[Vilnius International]* 36
Lithuanian Legislators Visit Sweden *[Vilnius International]* 36
Lithuania's USSR Talks Positions Detailed *[SOYUZ No 46]* 37
Orenburg Oblast, Vilnius Sign Wheat Accord *[Vilnius Radio]* 38
Deputies' 'Discontent' With Leaders Noted *[TASS]* 38
Leaders Hold News Conference on Blockade *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 11 Dec]* 39
Government Economic, Foreign Policies Criticized *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 4 Dec]* 39
Lithuanian Language Requirements Deferred *[PRAVDA 11 Dec]* 41
Ozolas Rebuffs Freedom League Criticism *[EKHO LITVY 13 Nov]* 41
Deputy Defense Minister Interviewed on Army *[Berlin DER MORGEN 24-25 Nov]* 42
Lithuanian Legislator Views Independence *[Berlin DER MORGEN 23 Nov]* 43
Talks Held on Lithuanians Serving in Soviet Army *[Vilnius International]* 44
Economists Warn Against 'Hastily Drafted' Laws *[TASS]* 44
Procurator on Soviet Interior Ministry Changes *[Vilnius Radio]* 44
Brazauskas Premieres New Radio Program *[Vilnius Radio]* 45
Reports of Soviets Jamming Broadcasts Invited *[Vilnius International]* 45
Lithuanian TV To Displace Moscow's Second Channel *[IZVESTIYA 30 Nov]* 45
New Lithuanian Radio, Television Heads Appointed *[Vilnius Radio]* 46
Lithuanian Human Rights Association Founded *[Vilnius International]* 46
Kaunas Demonstrators Picket Military *[EKHO LITVY 20 Nov]* 46
Officer Training Course Advertises for Applicants *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 2 Dec]* 46
Statisticians Cite 'Black' Price List *[IZVESTIYA 19 Nov]* 46
Writer Criticizes Antisemitic Article *[TASS]* 47

Caucasus

Georgia

Communist Party Issues Statement on Elections *[ZARYA VOSTOKA 4 Nov]* 47
Second Round, Runoff Elections Held in Republic 48
Results Reviewed *[ZARYA VOSTOKA 13 Nov]* 48
Communists Issue Statement *[ZARYA VOSTOKA 13 Nov]* 49
Results Assessed *[ZARYA VOSTOKA 17 Nov]* 50
Gamsakhurdia Discusses Supreme Soviet Tasks *[ZARYA VOSTOKA]* 51
Newly Elected Legislature Holds First Session 52
Agenda Detailed *[ZARYA VOSTOKA 15 Nov]* 52
Meetings Continue 16 Nov *[ZARYA VOSTOKA 16 Nov]* 54
Gamsakhurdia Addresses Session *[ZARYA VOSTOKA 16 Nov]* 55
Session Resumes Work 22 Nov *[ZARYA VOSTOKA 23 Nov]* 60
Law on Transitional Period *[ZARYA VOSTOKA 15 Nov]* 61
Decrees Published *[ZARYA VOSTOKA 16 Nov]* 63
Legislature Declares Amnesty *[ZARYA VOSTOKA 23 Nov]* 64
Three New Ministries Decreed *[ZARYA VOSTOKA 23 Nov]* 65
New Ministers Appointed *[ZARYA VOSTOKA 23 Nov]* 66
Supreme Soviet Chairman Interviewed on Policy *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 28 Nov]* 67
National Congress Organizational Collegium Meets *[MOLODEZH GRUZII 9 Nov]* 71
National Congressmen Discuss Supreme Soviet Ties *[ZARYA VOSTOKA 17 Nov]* 72
Prime Minister Sigua Comments on Economic Reform *[ZARYA VOSTOKA 16 Nov]* 73

Baltic Republics

Estonia

Western Trade Unions Offer Estonia Food Aid

LD0712203790 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1140 GMT 7 Dec 90

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Kharchenko]

[Text] Tallinn, 7 Dec (TASS)—The trade union organizations of a number of Western countries have approached the Central Union of Estonian Trade Unions with a proposal to render assistance in the form of food products, says a statement by the board of the Central Union of Estonian Trade Unions, which has been circulated here today.

The Central Union of Estonian Trade Unions has expressed its sincere gratitude to these trade union organizations for their attention and good feelings toward the working people of the republic. "However, proceeding from the realities of the situation, the board of the Central Union considers foreign food assistance, at least for the time being, more vital in other regions of the country to solve acute social problems," the statement says.

Estonia's Meri Comments on Swedish Visit

LD2911160390 Tallinn Domestic Service in Estonian 1000 GMT 29 Nov 90

[Interview with Estonian Foreign Minister Lennart Meri by correspondent Harri Tiido at Tallinn harbor on 29 November—recorded]

[Excerpts] [Tiido] Your trip—or stay—in Sweden was relatively short. What was packed into such a relatively short time?

[Meri] I had a meeting with Swedish Foreign Minister Andersson, and we discussed first and foremost the cooperation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania and the Nordic Council, after the Paris summit. We also discussed cooperation between Estonia and Sweden, which hopefully will find an outlet soon for becoming closer; also in this way new structures will be set up in the way of information bureaus both in Tallinn and Stockholm.

[Tiido] Was there any retrospective talk about the Paris summit and what took place, and any kind of assessment on the part of Sweden?

[Meri] The assessment of the Swedish side was positive on the whole, inasmuch as the Swedish side rated highly the attention which fell upon the Baltic states and the correct, balanced, and yet very active movements the representatives of the Baltic states displayed in Paris. [passage omitted]

Soon there will be a joint meeting of Nordic countries' foreign ministers and Baltic countries' foreign ministers in Copenhagen, and before or after it there will also be a longer working conference with Swedish Foreign Minister Andersson. [passage omitted]

Godmanis, Jurkans Attend Conference in Tallinn

LD1012190490 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian 0530 GMT 9 Dec 90

[Text] Yesterday Ivars Godmanis, prime minister of the Republic of Latvia, and Foreign Minister Janis Jurkans returned from a visit to Canada. Before going back to Riga, Ivars Godmanis set off for Estonia, where he took part in the third Tallinn conference. The prime ministers of Estonia and Lithuania, as well as authorized representatives of the governments of Armenia, Russia, Ukraine, Kazakhstan, and Belorussia, also participated in the conference. The participants spoke about the main prospects for mutual economic development as well as about the coordination of economic policy. From 1 January the creation of a consultative committee bureau of the governments is envisaged.

Military Reported Equipping Estonian TV, Radio

LD0812230190 Vilnius International Service in English 2230 GMT 7 Dec 90

[Text] [Announcer] In Tallinn yesterday, Estonian Prime Minister Edgar Savisaar met leaders of 30 parties and movements. All spoke unanimously against the Union treaty Estonia is being pressed to sign. The participants in the meeting looked for ways to dodge the Soviet Union's pressure. Meanwhile, the members of the Estonian Interfront are preparing a new action. Once again, Zela Petay:

[Petay] It's a little calmer in Tallinn, there are fewer military movements around Estonia [word indistinct] there have been in Lithuania and elsewhere. So, I think there has been less of a conflict with the military so far. I guess the government in Estonia hopes to keep it that way, although there have been people demonstrating against the military who wanted to stop supplying the military.

Another important issue is the fact that the military is helping the Intermovement set up its own radio and its own television. The radio was set up about a month ago, and now they say by the end of the year they will set up an Intermovement television station and broadcast two, or two and a half, hours a day of Intermovement programs and pro-Soviet [word indistinct] propaganda. That is being directly, apparently directly, helped by the military. They are bringing in the transmission equipment which has been withdrawn from East Europe and they are just transfering it to Estonia to set up this radio and television. I think that issue is very serious.

Communist Party's Current State Viewed

PM1112120190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Dec 90 Second Edition p 2

[Interview with V.S. Malkovskiy, secretary of the Estonian Communist Party "Coalition" Central Committee, by I. Teterin and V. Shirokov; place, date not given: "The Opportunity Is Still There..."]

[Text] The Estonian Communist Party today is split into several groups. This has noticeably weakened its influence in society, and has recently led Communists from the party's various "wings" to the awareness that the unification of forces is extremely necessary. The 21st Estonian Communist Party Congress will be held in mid-December this year. Will it become a "unification congress?" This was the topic of our correspondents' conversation with V.S. Malkovskiy, secretary of the Estonian Communist Party "Coalition" Central Committee.

[PRAVDA] Vladimir Sergeyevich, the 20th Estonian Communist Party Congress was held just over six months ago. And here we are, conversing on the eve of yet another forum of the republic's Communists—their 21st congress already. What events occurred during this brief and contradictory period, what is the Communist Party's state today?

[Malkovskiy] Indeed, this brief time period is packed with so many events and processes that the decades of the party's "placid" life in the past do not even remotely stand up to any comparison.

It is only natural that they have also left their imprint on the Communist Party's position in Estonia. A state of crisis within the Estonian Communist Party was noticeable even before the 20th congress. Its deepening was furthered by some rayon party organization and Central Committee secretaries. Afterwards they resigned from the party, feeling that they had accomplished their evil deed. These were the conditions in which the 20th congress was held, a congress at which some people perceived the way out of the prevailing situation as lying through the creation of an autonomous Estonian Communist Party and others through a party totally independent of the CPSU, because this very easily "fitted in" with the idea of Estonia's secession from the Union. Another section of Communists—mainly non-Estonian speaking—opposed such a solution by rigidly emotional methods. This resulted in the party's split, not so much along ideological as along nationality lines.

This state of the Estonian Communist Party is also influenced by the activity of the new Supreme Soviet, where the majority is made up of supporters of priority for the Estonian nation. The laws and resolutions they adopt, which discriminate against the non-Estonian community, aggravate the political and interethnic confrontation. The city soviets in Narva, Sillamyae, and Kohtla-Jarve, whose inhabitants are mainly non-Estonian speaking, are adopting decisions to suspend the effect of republican legislative acts which are at odds with the USSR Constitution and infringe the rights of the residents of these cities in the republic's territory. The confrontation is being aggravated by the revival of paramilitary formations.

None of this has helped in leading the party out of the crisis or rallying its ranks. Consequently, the Estonian Communist Party at present, by virtue of its fragmentation, is not exerting the proper influence on processes under way in the republic. The measures for leading the Communist Party out of the crisis, which were adopted by some 20th congress delegates, proved to be wrong. The Estonian Communist Party's numerical strength has almost halved, and more than 130 delegates to the 20th congress have resigned from the party. Problems concerning the utilization and preservation of the party's material base are developing as a result of the Estonian Government's latest actions.

The current crisis processes are equally dangerous for Communists representing both of the republic's linguistic communities. The extrication from the critical situation is not promoted by the existence of the republican party organization's two parallel structures.

[PRAVDA] About the contradictions, while we are on the subject. We recall the difficulty you had in taking your step at the last congress—joining the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee coalition structure and later becoming its secretary. Some of those who shared your views until recently, yearning for unbreakable ties with the CPSU, were prepared to appraise this step almost as treason, careerism, and so on. But even then we felt that the opportunity to preserve the party's unity was at that time more important for you than all the ideological and political disagreements among congress delegates. Is this opportunity greater or lesser today?

[Malkovskiy] Even at the 20th congress many delegates, having arrived there instructed by their Communists to uphold different ideological and organizational principles, were nonetheless unanimous on one point—not to split the party. They realized that the Estonian Communist Party stood to lose a lot as a result of its fragmentation. This provided the main contradiction which had to be resolved during a few days of very intense and nervous work. Extreme views constantly pushed in the direction of a split, but the coalition Central Committee formula was actually discovered at the congress and the majority of delegates agreed with it. With this solution of the contradictions, each one maintained his own ideological and political platforms but, at the same time, we preserved an opportunity for mutual penetration and integration of existing positions. Furthermore, both party structures retained their organizational ties with the CPSU, having elected delegates to its 28th congress. This was why I decided to join the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee's coalition structure and was elected its secretary. For the sake of preserving the

likelihood and the opportunity that a greater part of Communists could be united with the passage of time.

It would be dishonest to appraise today's situation in the Estonian Communist Party as an achievement of complete mutual understanding and unity. But much has also emerged that is held in common. Both organizational structures—true enough, to a different extent—provide real opposition to government decisions aimed against working people's interests. A realistic appraisal of the situation prevailing today in the republic's economy has made everyone realize the need to maintain ties with the union market. The non-Estonian speaking community's growing resistance to Supreme Soviet laws and resolutions aimed at infringing its rights has forced the supporters of national priorities to abandon this discriminatory approach. The principle of equality of nations has been approved by both sets of party members. This approach is still far removed at parliamentary level. Furthermore, the 28th CPSU Congress documents answered—even though not fully—the questions which provided the stumbling block at the 20th Estonian Communist Party Congress. I think that the change of views was also influenced by the results, or rather the lessons, of the so-called "transition" period and the development of events in the Union and the other Baltic republics. On the basis of all this, an opportunity is emerging to find common points of contact, even though this process is difficult and does not occur overnight.

[PRAVDA] Let us try and realistically compare—on the basis of facts and figures—the state of the Estonian Communist Party's two wings today. But we are certainly not doing this for the purpose of forecasting the deployment of forces within the party or which one would overpower the other in the protracted skirmish. It is much more important to perceive something else: What has the party lost through its lack of unity, to what extent has its influence in society declined?

[Malkovskiy] It was no accident when I said that the change of views was influenced by the results of the so-called "transition" period. I do not rule out the possibility that the idea of maintaining the Estonian Communist Party as a superautonomous party has failed to yield the result expected by its leaders. Only about 5,000 members have joined it. Furthermore, a certain proportion of them are against a complete break of ties with the CPSU and have retained their party membership cards. An additional 52,000 Communists are difficult to unambiguously classify as belonging to either organized structure, but they hold CPSU membership cards and remain unregistered.

The main causes of the decline of the Estonian Communist Party's influence lie largely in its position of trailing in the wake of events, its recent inaction and lack of preparedness for work in the conditions of a real multiparty system and in opposition, and its inability to effectively perceive and uphold the interests of the workers, peasants, and intelligentsia, in other words of work comrades regardless of their ethnic origins.

[PRAVDA] There is no escaping reality: Today's situation in the Estonian Communist Party is especially alarming against the background of the economic, sociopolitical, and moral crisis. After all, a party torn apart by contradictions, a party whose leaders on both sides divide Communists into "pure" and "impure," cannot effectively play even the role of a strong and constructive opposition to the government. Is this not why some decisions with overtones of national romanticism have had such an easy passage through Estonia's legislature, is this not why the legislative initiative is in the hands of absolutely new forces which lack any serious political experience?

[Malkovskiy] Absolutely correct. It is impossible to effectively influence the Supreme Soviet's work in conditions when members of one and the same party vote differently on one and the same question.

Some people wrongly assume that different opinions are the utmost manifestation of democracy. If this were the case, we could arrive at absurd superpluralism when the USSR president and the CPSU general secretary—being one and the same person—holds... different points of views [in each capacity]. As a matter of fact, the Estonian initiators of democracy—namely the People's Front legislative faction—do not hold this view. Enjoying a majority in the Supreme Soviet, they are very strict with their deputies if the latter vote against the agreed position.

To become a constructive opposition to the government and actively exercise legislative initiative, we need not only bold and unanimous voting but also the creation of conditions for the elaboration of Communists' intelligent and united stance. This is impossible to achieve under divergent structures. Furthermore, we need specialists in lawmaking, jurists, economists, sociologists, and psychologists as Communist deputies. This can be achieved only under a united apparatus, whose structure incorporates the appropriate institutions.

[PRAVDA] Let us now turn back to the upcoming 21st Estonian Communist Party Congress. Let us be blunt about it: It has to finally decide whether or not Estonia's Communists will remain united within a single party. To achieve unification, real steps to meet each other halfway and reciprocal compromises are required. We would like to know your stance: What compromises would be realistic today? What steps must be taken to save the Estonian Communist Party from a final split?

[Malkovskiy] The main issue, which was the cornerstone of the split at the 20th congress, was the problem of Estonia's complete state independence. The realities of the recent past prove that expectations of economic support by European countries were utopian, and any break of ties with the union market would result in the republic's either losing 97 percent of raw material supply sources or budgeting to acquire them at world prices

payable in convertible foreign currency. Even the purchase of strong wheat for bread baking—let alone oil products, metals, and so on—will have to paid for in foreign currency which Estonia lacks. All this can already be felt. It is therefore perfectly realistic to arrive at mutual understanding within the party on the need to participate in the Union market. Other provisions of the treaty between the USSR and Estonia could be built on this basis. At the same time, it is impossible to reject the Estonian people's constitutional right to self-determination, but this is a process involving talks with the center, at which questions of the protection of USSR citizens' rights in Estonia will be solved in addition to economic and ownership problems.

The second disagreement concerned the Estonian Communist Party's autonomy. Some people perceived autonomy as withdrawal from the CPSU, others as a territorial party organization in Estonia enjoying greater autonomy. The resolution of this contradiction was facilitated by the 28th CPSU Congress and Paragraph 22 of the new CPSU Rules. Union republic communist parties are recognized as autonomous. In my view, this provision should suit the first group. At the same time, the second group agrees that the Estonian Communist Party's program and normative documents should comply with the CPSU's basic tenets. For the time being, a certain part of party members have different interpretations of Article 1 and 2 of the Rules. It is, however, impossible to ignore the fact that the Estonian Communist Party shares identical ideological views with the CPSU as regards expressing the interests of the working class, the peasantry, and the intelligentsia. Communist Party members from both "wings" of the Estonian Communist Party belong to the organizational structures of the CPSU and its Central Committee, Politburo, and Central Control Commission. In other words, mutual agreement can be reached on this question as well.

There has been a reappraisal of the thesis about the indigenous nation's political, economic, and social priority.

Party unity can be achieved not through the solution of theoretical long-term questions, important though they may be, but on the basis of joint actions. This is why it is proposed that the congress adopt the Estonian Communist Party's action program for extrication from the crisis situation in the party and society.

If Communists accept all this as an answer to the question "What is to be done?", if they are prepared to implement the plans, the Estonian Communist Party will live, act, and develop.

[PRAVDA] The congress will probably also decide the future of party property and will discuss the need for its more efficient utilization. It is well known that totally unconnected organizations, not in any way related to the Estonian Communist Party, are now laying claims to this property.

[Malkovskiy] Everything acquired by the party is its property, and only party members can dispose of whatever belongs to it. If something is surplus to requirements, it will of course be handed over to those who need it most—more likely than not the health care services, culture, and education. But this can only be done by Communists at the congress.

[PRAVDA] One last question. It somehow happened that our conversation was reduced mainly to the Estonian Communist Party's losses over the past few months. Did the party make any real gains at all during that same period, in the cadres, political, or conceptual spheres? And what have you yourself gained during the same period?

[Malkovskiy] Unfortunately, for as long as we Communists remain fragmented and function within different organizational structures, any discussion will more than likely focus on the Estonian Communist Party's losses.

At the same time, it can be noted that the present situation, the new conditions of a real multiparty system and confrontation, and the ongoing political debate among Communists have to a certain extent enabled us to take a fresh and nontraditional look at the methods and forms of party activity.

Lessons from both negative and positive experiences are useful not only for the Estonian Communist Party but also for the CPSU which is undergoing renewal. This is probably the largest gain by both the party and myself personally.

Press Criticisms of Estonian Government Detailed

91UN0398B Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in Russian 13 Nov 90 p 3

[Article by V. Tomingas: "Not a Day Without a Sensation"]

[Excerpt] "Estonian Watergate" was the highlight of the week before last in the republic press (see SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA, 5 November), whereas last week passions raged on account of "the declaration of eight." Readers who follow political events are, of course, aware of the topic. The declaration was also published in our newspaper. We also reported on the initial response by the prime minister of the Republic, which overflowed with sarcasm.

What attracted the attention of the Estonian press in "the declaration of the eight?" First of all, the alliance of the political leaders of the "Free Estonia" Association and the Estonian Committee, whose relationship until recently was emphatically cold. The very fact that the names of Indrek Toomo and Tunne Kelam, Jaak Allik, and Kaido Kama appear next to one another under a joint document is a sensation that has caused a great deal of guessing. However, an instruction given to Siim Kallas—to conduct consultations aimed at forming a national unity government, which, in essence, amounts

to an open challenge to the cabinet of Edgar Savisaar rather than a scheme against it—is a sensation to the second or third power.

It is not surprising that the portraits of "those who disturbed the peace" (despite the peace having been very relative before) together with lengthy interviews with them were immediately featured prominently in all Estonian newspapers. Responding to the questions of an EDAZI journalist, Siim Kallas noted the incompetence of the current government, which is "an insult to the Estonian people;" the government has exhausted its allowance for mistakes. Instead of looking for friends, it makes enemies. In an interview by the newspaper RAHVA HAAL, Siim Kallas blamed the government for its inability to conduct a dialogue with Moscow, where the keys to the independence of Estonia are actually found. He called the current foreign policy of Estonia a laughing stock. Let us note that this was said precisely during a visit to England by Minister of Foreign Affairs Lennart Meri.

As far as the shadow or, as the fashion is to put it at present, alternative cabinet is concerned, Siim Kallas noted that there also are capable people in the current government who could retain their posts. In any event, however, it is necessary to broaden the political base of the government and, in particular, to bring into it authoritative representatives of the Russian community.

Indrek Toome stated definitively in EDAZI that his signature under the declaration does not mean he intends to claim once again the position of head of government or some other prominent position. In the opinion of Indrek Toome, a temporary coalition with the Estonian Committee should demonstrate that in the interest of the development of Estonia it is possible even for the extremes to cooperate. This is to say that there is an open field for joint work with other forces.

Indrek Toome believes that two avenues are characteristic of the operation of the current government: the attainment of independence by Estonia and the struggle against potential contenders for power. Unfortunately, the second avenue at times begins to dominate, producing still new enemies. This exhausting struggle, which has become an end unto itself, cannot go on any longer.

PAEVALEHT devoted an entire page in its Friday issue to the government crisis. In the center of the page, there is a large portrait of Edgar Savisaar looking at his watch. Next to it is a declaration of the People's Front, naturally, in support of the government that is pursuing a moderate centrist policy in a complex political environment. Discoursing about coalitions, Enn Poldroos comes to the conclusion that democracy presupposes a choice from among several variants of viable combinations that enjoy the confidence of a sufficient majority. Meanwhile, the aspiration to form "a wall-to-wall government" that leaves no room for the opposition unavoidably leads to a dictatorship. The authors of the declaration know this well. What do they want then, asks Enn Poldroos.

Mart Kadastik in EDAZI responds to this in a simple and concise manner: An opportunity to jump on the bandwagon of real politics presented itself to the Estonian Committee and "Free Estonia" Association, and, being pragmatists, they did not let it slip. Enn Poldroos completes his article with a bow to the prime minister: "I am not convinced that Savisaar would be an appropriate figure for the position of head of government in an evolved and stable state that has gained independence (though he may become one as he is still young). In my perception, however, during a period of crisis, he is ideally qualified for the role of a leader because at such critical moments we need a person who has a perceptive mind, dynamism, and force capable of going through the wall, if there is no time to look for a door. At present, I do not see another candidate for the post of prime minister who is capable of competing with Savisaar."

Recent days have shown how large the abscess of domestic political intrigues in Estonia really is, believes Mart Kadastik (EDAZI). He is seconded by Ago Vilo: When you observe ambitious jockeying in our abnormal society, you are reinforced in your belief that many participants in it put the interests of their party well above those of the Republic and the people (RAHVA HAAL). It appears that the need to remove the ulcer is clear to all. Yet how is this to be done? How much time will it take? One would think that the coming week will clear things up to some degree. [passage omitted]

Call for New Estonian Government Published

91UN0398A Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in Russian 6 Nov 90 p 1

[ETA report on declaration read on Estonian radio and Estonian television on 4 November: "A Way Toward Settling the Crisis"]

[Text] **On Sunday, 4 November, the following declaration was read on the information programs of Estonian Radio and Estonian Television.**

Proceeding from the aspiration to secure national unity in Estonia, which was expressed at the Estonian Congress and a joint meeting of the parties of Estonia, a meeting of representatives of various political forces was held in Tallinn on 4 November. Participants in the meeting are aware of the need to arrest the deteriorating sociopolitical and economic crisis in Estonia, restore a safe balance in our society, and a find a solution to the deteriorating crisis of power. It is an urgent necessity to discontinue damaging the international prestige of Estonia further, which is due to our uncoordinated foreign policy.

The only opportunity to achieve this is found in the formation of a government of national unity, which will have the confidence of the Supreme Soviet and the Estonian Committee, will support the activities of the Supreme Soviet chairman, and will be open to all democratic forces of Estonia. It was stressed that direct participation in the government by all progressive forces

of Estonia, as well as authoritative representatives of the Russian-speaking population of the Republic, is necessary for the fruitful work of the government in seeking a genuine legal restoration of the Republic of Estonia. It was found equally natural that members of the present government whose activities have promoted confidence in them and produced positive results will continue their work.

The participants in the meeting addressed to the chairman of the Central Council of Trade Unions of Estonia, Siim Kallas, a proposal to embark on consultations with all democratic forces of Estonia in order to ascertain opportunities for creating such a government as soon as possible, and at the same time to inform the public of the republic about these negotiations.

Jaak Allik, Sirje Endre, Siim Kallas, Kaido Kama, Tunne Kelam, Toivo Kuldsepp, Vardo Rumessen, and Indrek Toome signed the declaration.

Allik Discusses Call for New Estonian Government

91UN0398C Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in Russian 16 Nov 90 p 3

[Interview with Jaak Allik by G. Kacheva; place and date not given: "Jaak Allik: 'We Just Offered To Help the Government'"]

[Text] What may bring to an end the crisis in Estonia, which keeps growing? What may restore a safe balance in our society and find a solution for resolving the growing crisis of power, as well as stop damaging the international prestige of Estonia through an uncoordinated foreign policy? It is only possible to ensure this by forming a government of national unity, a government open to all democratic forces of Estonia, and by direct participation in it of all progressive forces, as well as authoritative representatives of the Russian-speaking populace of the republic.

This is the essence of a declaration signed on 4 November by eight well-known representatives of various political forces of Estonia. Naturally, attitudes toward this document varied. A response in the form of rejection was the most apparent. This was expressed through a stormy debate in the legislature, pickets on Toompea, and communiques by the boards of particular political groups: We do not consider it possible to endorse "the proposal of eight."...

How did the authors of the declaration respond to this? I asked Jaak Allik several questions.

[Kacheva] Jaak, have you been upset very much by this stormy response rejecting your ideas?

[Allik] Do you mean pickets in front of the residence of the head of government? There are proponents of this concept as well, but let us make this clear: They are not on the picket line. As a rule, those who are "against" do the picketing. This is a form of protest. Have you ever seen picketers who came out "in favor" of something?

[Kacheva] What about the declarations of "nonendorsement?"

[Allik] For example, the declaration of the Social Democratic Party, which belongs to the government coalition and supports the government, was very interesting. To my mind, the Social Democrats approved the concept of creating a broad coalition in this declaration but stated that they would not endorse our declaration. We do not need this anyway, however. As far as we are concerned, we put forth an idea. Certain forces tried to fuel unhealthy emotions on this account and virtually begin "disciplinary proceedings" against those who signed the declaration. Of course, charges regarding a coalition of the Communist Party and the Estonian National Independence Party are the most ridiculous. People fail to understand simple things. For example, Communists and national radicals, representatives of the People's Front and of the Russian-speaking fractions work in all legislative commissions. It turns out that we may work together in Supreme Soviet commissions, and nobody would accuse me of giving up my convictions, creating some coalition, or working in the commission with a representative of this or that group. I absolutely fail to understand why we cannot work in the Republic Government as well, all the more so because the most complex and controversial issues, for example, citizenship and taxes, are resolved specifically in the Supreme Soviet, whereas the government is the executive organ of the legislature. Therefore, I think that the legislature should go on making the most important political decisions, taking into account the opinions of various parties and fractions, as it does now. The executive power should have a broader base—this is what our concept is.

[Kacheva] During a general political debate in the legislature, you noted that the current social base of the government—approximately 40 percent of the population and deputies—is inadequate and needs to be broadened. A government is needed that, putting it figuratively, will draw 105 votes in the legislature.

[Allik] Indeed, at present a minority of deputies support the government in our legislature. Meanwhile, the support of a majority is necessary—well, maybe not 105 deputies, but at least 80. It is also necessary under the present very critical circumstances for the best minds of the Republic to be assembled in the government, even if they are not members of the People's Front. That is to say, we simply offered our help to the government. The situation is very complicated at present; the crisis in the Republic will not be overcome with the resources of just one fraction. Here is another consideration: At present, who can give a guarantee that the activities of some other government will bring about improvements in the economy? Nobody can give such a guarantee. If the crisis gets worse and life becomes still more difficult, however, Savisaar will have to explain himself to the people. I think that 60 percent of the voters will not believe he has

done everything possible in order to avert the worst. If, suppose, Savisaar, Toome, Kelam, and Lebedev tell this to the people together, they will understand: indeed, all parties, all fractions, the best minds have attempted to solve the problem. Therefore, because there have been no changes for the better for now, there is no other way out, and belts ought to be tightened. I repeat: This is what our concept was about—the concept of creating a government based on a broad coalition.

[Kacheva] We must admit that it came as a complete surprise to many people.

[Allik] In recent years, Estonia has been running ahead of other republics in many respects. At present, many people are following the path it blazed yesterday in the course of arguments and struggle. I hope that we will be the first in this endeavor of ours as well. I am convinced that they will arrive at this in Moscow, Lithuania, Georgia, and Eastern Europe—everywhere. Let us recall that on 7 November, Gorbachev, Yeltsin, Ryzhkov, and Popov laid a wreath at a monument to Lenin together. They will have to walk next to each other and work together because the issues our society is facing are so difficult that we will not accomplish anything if we keep getting in one another's way all the time, suspecting one another, and seeing enemies in particular parties or individuals. After all, all of us want to live better. All of us want to survive this winter. All of us dream of a truly democratic society.

[Kacheva] Therefore, cooperation is the only path that will help us to survive. Does this need to be proven now by overcoming resistance?

[Allik] This needs to be proven. After all, there is another way that is being discussed in the Union—this is the way of a dictatorship, of an iron fist, of an end to democracy. We did not embark on perestroyka in order to give the monopoly on power to some people after taking it away from others, and thus switch from one dictatorship to another. No, it was not in order to do this....

Sillari Addresses Estonian Party Plenum

91UN0460A Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in Russian 7 Nov 90 p 2

["Text of report with some cuts" of report by E.-A. Sillari, first secretary of the Communist Party of Estonia Central Committee, at 2 November 1990 Communist Party of Estonia Central Committee plenum convened to discuss preparations for the 21st Congress of the Communist Party of Estonia—SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA headline]

[Text] Communists have truly been awaiting today's plenum. The transitional period is coming to an end, but its completion may be made legitimate only by the 21st Congress of the Communist Party of Estonia. We need to decide today when the congress will be held and to determine the delegate election procedure. As distinct from former times, these are not procedural matters predetermined by the party rules and the traditions of preceding congresses. They are problems of great importance for the Communist Party of Estonia caused by the situation in the party.

The information at the disposal of the Communist Party of Estonia Central Committee Bureau and the reports coming in from city and district party committee secretaries show that the communists want primarily clarity in respect of the Communist Party of Estonia's present position. What is the Communist Party of Estonia today? What are our relations with the so-called Gusev-Panfilov Central Committee? Will the policy of the 20th congress be preserved or will it be revised? May the Communist Party of Estonia, which has proclaimed itself independent, be considered a part of the CPSU? Does membership of the Communist Party of Estonia mean support for the existence of the USSR in a renewed form or, on the contrary, its disintegration?

The lack of precise answers to these questions is considered an indicator of the weakness of the Communist Party of Estonia's coalition leadership. Thousands of members of the CPSU from both the Estonian and Russian communities have decided altogether to terminate relations with the Communist Party of Estonia, which they consider some kind of indeterminate force. There are, further, thousands of communists who are sure that the advancement of a single clear position on these matters is now our most important concern, for which clear-cut decisions of party forums are essential.

While agreeing in principle with the critical evaluation of the situation in the Communist Party of Estonia, the Central Committee Bureau would nonetheless like to call the attention of members of the Central Committee and also all party members to the fact that the fate of the Communist Party in Estonia cannot be determined merely by a decision of a Central Committee plenum or congress. It is not enough to simply say that all will be well in the Communist Party of Estonia and for the Communist Party of Estonia as of tomorrow. Generally, as communists and as inhabitants of Estonia, we must recognize that considerably more is at stake today than the fate of our party. We are living under conditions of intensifying crisis in all walks of life. Production is declining, people's living standard is falling, crime is growing. People are in the grip of anxiety about the future. The political struggle, in which both major political forces and baby parties are participating, is becoming increasingly bitter. People no longer know which movement or which leader may be trusted at all. And are the leaders of all movements at all interested in the day-to-day concerns of the ordinary individual?

We believe that in the situation which has taken shape in Estonia and around it it would be a profound mistake for the Communist Party of Estonia and, particularly, for its directive bodies to concentrate all their forces only on a solution of their internal ideological and political problems. Let us recognize that the Communist Party of Estonia is not in today's Estonia a decisive factor and

that little in the life of Estonia depends on our internal political convulsions. And if anything does so depend, it is only in the sense that we can even further increase tension between the Estonian and Russian communities or cause additional misunderstandings in the relations of the forces taking part in politics. After all, an elementary truth, which, it is true, is forgotten at a time of the igniting of political passions, is that a political party and its directive bodies are carrying out, for all that, some people's wishes and that they are supporting the interests of certain strata of society and implementing some program or other. And their influence on society ultimately depends on whether their program propositions correspond to reality and the interests of certain social forces and whether the party knows how to put them into practice. Finally, internal monolithic character depends precisely on this, not on the laying of new boundary strips on the political landscape.

At the 20th Communist Party of Estonia Congress we adopted a program which records: "Communists consider their priority task the assurance of social rights and social safeguards for all public formations and each individual." These words had a hollow ring, perhaps, at the session of the congress on 25 March, but in today's Estonia, in our opinion, they now have very specific content permitting us to fight for them.

We are living in a world in which the public and the leaders of the great powers are interested in stability, in the preservation of the Union led by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev included. A Union in which a market would be opened for guaranteed commodity exchange, a Union in which nuclear power would be owned by a single center, not 15 mutually hostile centers. We live in Europe, where tension is declining sharply and the borders preventing the free movement of capital and people are disappearing. We are in a situation where the powerful in the West and in the East are opening the currency valves for economic assistance to the central authorities of the Union, thereby supporting the conversion of one-sixth of the globe into a stable, civilized region with a lower conflict level.

Regardless of all the declarations and exercises in the erection of border posts, we are still a particle of the economic system of the Union, with which 97 percent of our economy is connected. And this is a giant system, in which crisis and lack of control are intensifying and the protection of the ordinary individual is lacking. Moldova, Armenia, and Azerbaijan are on the verge of civil war. The central authorities of the Union and the leadership of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic have an equal interest in the preservation of the Soviet Union and are prepared to apply both administrative and economic measures to this end. If some people hoped to use the Russian leader against the Soviet leader, it should be clear today that this is simply an illusion. It should be noted also that Estonia's rejection of deputy activity in the central organs of power of the Soviet Union, nonparticipation in the elaboration of the common principles of economic cooperation, and the severance of ties to the departments distributing all-Union resources and also failure to abide by its own supply commitments have led to Estonia's influence on the Union economy weakening increasingly. At the same time, however, a lessening of our dependence on that same Union economy has not been observed.

The political steps of the three Baltic republics have differed somewhat of late, but no particular difference can be observed in their position, in our view. The gap between the independence which has been declared and which is encountering growing understanding in the West on the one hand, and the economic dependence and instability bringing us closer to chaos on the other, persists.

In 1991 economic crisis will extend to all sectors of the republic economy, industry and agriculture in particular. Whereas this year industrial output will have declined three percent, next year it will decline 10-20 percent. The reason for this is primarily supply difficulties, particularly in respect of imported products. Calculations show that only one-third of the production program for 1991 is backed by material resources. The situation is particularly grim at enterprises of local industry, many of which are specialized in a narrow range of products built on the basis of imported raw material. In this sector only 15 percent of the government commission is provided with materials, and there is a danger of many enterprises coming to a halt altogether in 1991.

Relying on horizontal relations, the republic is being sluggish in tackling questions of the procurement of material resources in the central authorities of the USSR. Fuel supplies are inadequate at 250 boiler houses. It is feared that part of the population of Tallinn, Tartu, and certain other cities will have to move for the winter to the country as a consequence of the fuel shortage.

Together with the impending economic catastrophe, the political crisis in society is intensifying. Obviously, the transition from the former condition to a new, democratic society may only be accomplished via a certain crisis period. A hitherto state-ized society is once again beginning to organize and regulate itself. Institutions characteristic of a civil society are taking shape. When state-owned property is privatized, social groups and classes with a different attitude toward the means of production will be formed. They will, naturally, as a consequence of this, have different political interests, and these differences will in all probability be defended by different parties. In line with this a multiparty system will take shape also, there will be multiparty elections, and democratically elected organs of state power fully responsible to their electorate will emerge.

A most profound cause of the present political instability is precisely the fact that we lack all this as yet. The social structure of society has not yet evolved and the emergent political parties are more politicized communities than spokesmen for the interests of some real social force. These proto-parties are imitating a multiparty system,

but in reality represent no one other than themselves. The same applies also to the people's deputies, who are expressing their personal political views, but not the wishes of the electorate. But inasmuch as they represent no one, neither can anyone recall them. The same thing applies to the government and its members. Nor do they have any feedback with the people, as the exponent of the highest authority.

These adversities of the transitional period are by nature objective, and the replacement of some leaders by others would not alter their nature, although, of course, the personal attributes of this politician or the other could increase the instability. This undoubtedly needs to be borne in mind in the present acute situation.

The crisis state of society in Estonia is being intensified further also by the fact that the stage of the mass public movement which began in 1987-1988 has come to an end. The center of gravity of political activity has shifted from Pevcheskoye Field and Gorkholla to the Supreme Soviet. Movements are growing into parties, and a new ruling elite has begun to take shape.

The replacement of one stage in society's development by another is always a critical moment. However, in this case the situation is made worse by the fact that the goals of the preceding period, that of the mass popular movement, are still unattained. Virtually nothing has happened. The Soviet Union has not disintegrated, Estonia has not detached itself from the Soviet Union, the unit of currency is, as before, the ruble and the army is the Soviet Army. The people are not satisfied by any results of the "singing revolution." The national-romantic mood is giving way to economic concerns.

The political situation in Estonia is being destabilized by the weakness of the forces of the center also. Even before the elections to the Supreme Soviet it was clear that by blows being inflicted from the right and the left extreme forces had succeeded in smashing the political center. The election results confirmed this. The fratricidal power struggle between the Popular Front and "Free Estonia" merely illustrates the disintegration of the center forces.

The crisis of the center has gradually moved to the outskirts of the political spectrum also. Marginal groups are disintegrating. Power in the republic is beginning to be atomized. The leadership, of course, perceives this and is taking increasingly radical steps, but it has increasingly fewer forces for implementing these radical measures. When the levers of power do not work, attempts to once again centralize power are made. This, in turn, is given a hostile reception now at one, now at the other end of the republic. The intensifying crisis of power threatens a fall of the government. Despite the fact that a change of guard will not remove the causes of the crisis, it could, nonetheless, occur. Fear of this is prompting the government, in turn, to take steps to divert the people's attention from the real problems and simultaneously demonstrate the strength of the government. Not only the propagandistically dazzling foreign policy but also, for example, the encroachment on the property of the Communist Party of Estonia come under this heading.

There has been repeated mention among the Estonian public of the moral crisis which has afflicted our society. This is frequently tied in with the half century of oppression of Communist ideology. We believe that there is nothing surprising in the emergence of a moral crisis. It is not in any way unique. After all, our society is moving toward a market economy, doing so in extremely unorganized fashion, without any serious preparation, and under the conditions of a shortage of initial capital. The transition from one type of organization of the economy to another is always accompanied by a change in life's moral principles—this has been the case in other countries also. No ideology and no moral admonitions will help avoid property stratification, unemployment, lupine morals, and an aspiration in the interests of business to sell off one's fatherland bit by bit. But the specific or even tragic aspect of our situation is that we want to combine the new economy and the corresponding morals with the social safeguards that were in effect in the past totalitarian society.

Such is our vision of the state of life in Estonia. The Central Committee Bureau believes that the position at which we have arrived today corresponds in general outline to the forecast contained in the Communist Party of Estonia Program. Let us try now, taking the propositions of this program as a basis, to map out our platform for Estonia's further development. It is our duty to express our opinion and to defend it.

The speaker went on to observe that the Communist Party of Estonia is in today's Estonia outside of actual politics, as it were. He emphasized that militant anticommunism has become a very routine aspect of our life. However, as distinct from the participants in present politics, our party has nothing to lose. We may, if we consider it necessary, propose solutions that are contrary to prevailing public opinion and the precepts of the leaders of political forces. Solutions that the bulk of the population does not see as yet.

We should in consideration of these circumstances shape our platform pertaining to the extrication of Estonian society from the intensifying crisis. Beginning with the Communist Party of Estonia Program, we have specified and substantiated our positions, doing this at Central Committee plenums and party activist meetings and in decisions of the Central Committee Bureau. We believe that the roots of the present difficulties are hidden in the need for the simultaneous accomplishment of two supercomplex tasks. They, these tasks, consist of extricating the economy from crisis on the path of the development of modern production and winning Estonia's statehood. Both these goals should create a society in which a living standard comparable with that of developed countries, human rights, civil liberties, and a socially protected life are secured.

What is important here? Primarily the fact that the laying of the foundations of the market economy and the creation of statehood, that is, economics and politics and continuity and the new reality, be in balance between themselves, that all that is done not bring about new injustice, and that in taking steps in the name of future freedom we not lay waste tomorrow's dinner table and not isolate Estonia from progressive processes in the surrounding world. In the Bureau's opinion, we have every reason today to speak of these, and not only these, dangers.

We would like to emphasize once again the need for the formulation and precise presentation to the people of a plan of basic measures of the transition both to the market economy and to statehood. The Communist Party of Estonia's idea of the content of the transition is set forth in the platform of Communist Party of Estonia delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress and the political declaration of the republic meeting of Communist Party of Estonia activists held on 3 August. The need for a plan which analyzes the initial situation, the content of the steps being taken and, what is particularly relevant, the influence of each step on the actual life of the main groups of the population can be seen increasingly clearly with every passing day. This would be extremely necessary as a possible basis for consensus of Estonia's progressive forces. Such a realistic platform would also be an alternative to the continuing race for the laurels of the proclaimer of Estonia's independence.

Certain thoughts about key issues of such a plan. The need to avoid new injustice and secure the material position of people living on their wages is pointed out in three decisions of the Communist Party of Estonia Central Committee Bureau. Our memorandum on the organization of economic activity in the Republic of Estonia records: The standard and quality of living of the people cannot be sacrificed in the formulation of Estonia's economic orientation in the name of hopes for future success. Measures to overcome the crisis difficulties should be combined with future-oriented economic efforts. The first may in no event be sacrificed to the latter, otherwise the economic downturn would end for Estonia in failure and an explosion of the tension in society. This was recorded prior to 15 October. What is the situation today?

We do not as yet have real powers for influencing the Supreme Soviet. I hope that I express the opinion of all members of the Central Committee when I urgently request of the Supreme Soviet that it be truly the highest organ of power of Estonia and exercise this power in the sphere of the economy in the name of the genuine interests of the people.

The state of relations with the central authorities of the Soviet Union and treaties with republics of the Soviet Union are that which is most important, on which practically everything, in both the economy and the satisfaction of vital requirements and in progress en route to state independence, depends. Eastern policy is determining, however unpopular this assertion may be. However, this determining role is in no way to be discerned in the actions of those who are currently realizing political power in Estonia. Are we capable of appreciating what losses and what breakdowns could be brought about by the fact that we have renounced all versions of cooperation with the economic union taking shape in the Soviet Union.

A key question in the sphere of policy is, in our view, the further broadening of democracy. Our endeavors, whether they concern the economy or the political arrangement, are bringing us closer to the stage at which the people will have to begin to adopt substantive decisions. The Communist Party of Estonia is concerned that **democracy in practice is frequently identified with anticommunism.** However, we believe that this is a secondary phenomenon of the transitional period. We consider a broader problem of the development of democracy the population's participation in decision-making on matters concerning its basic interests. Let us recall here ideas heard in documents adopted by the Central Committee earlier. First, regular notification of the public of the state of the economy and its immediate future has still not been organized. Second, our legislators in the Supreme Soviet are in contact with their electorate too infrequently. It could be considered that the meetings held earlier and the electorate's instructions were a manifestation of the formalism of the times of stagnation. However, with what has this been replaced now, when the importance of an independent, alternative decision has grown appreciably? In our view, authority is being decentralized more slowly than it should be.

The idea that without independence we will hardly have democracy, but that independence without democracy could emerge very easily was expressed at the 20th Communist Party of Estonia Congress. Today the whole republic can see how correct this forecast was. The danger of a limitation of democracy and glasnost in Estonia by way of the establishment of a local authoritarian regime has clearly emerged. The Communist Party of Estonia shares the concern of other parties of Estonia in this connection. It is firmly opposed to the proposals and intentions concerning a concentration of the fullness of power in just one set of hands and the consolidation of autocracy.

In our opinion, the sole possibility of stabilizing the situation and emerging from the political impasse lies in the achievement of consensus based on as broad a coalition of political forces as possible in order with great unanimity to overcome the impending dangers and difficulties. The authority of a "strong hand" on a narrowing social base will only intensify the crisis and entail consequences which are hard to rectify.

And one further problem that has been broached in the political life of Estonia, but which has not been resolved as yet. It is the question of **civil peace.** A group of Tartu intellectuals put forward an appeal for the conclusion of

a civil peace agreement providing for the protection of people and national groups. The Communist Party of Estonia Central Committee supported this appeal, but other forces have shown no interest in this. To be objective, it should be noted that it is in the interests of securing civil peace that the Communist Party of Estonia has attempted with its resources to link the Estonian and Russian communities more closely. Compromises to somehow bring the two communities closer together have been made. Unfortunately, this has served as grounds for accusations against the Communist Party of Estonia of inconsistency from both the Estonian and Russian sides. However, we agreed to this inasmuch as civil peace is more important. We see today that relations in Estonia are becoming increasingly strained. I shall give just one example. Even if we leave aside the Soviet Army and the KGB, there are in Estonia no less than five operational armed formations or those endeavoring to arm themselves: These are the militia, police operating in parallel with them, "Kodukaytse," the divided "Kaitseliit," and the volunteer worker squads. Do we not have too many defenders just for tiny Estonia? And have they given us greater protection? I would like the Supreme Soviet, the local self-governing authorities, and the administrative bodies to give some thought to this. If one looks at what is happening currently in Moldova, it should be understood that civil peace, which has been preserved with us as yet, is a great value. It needs defending, but not with rifles but with aid of good sense.

Briefly about our intraparty concerns. Three main schools have taken shape in the former Communist Party of Estonia since the 20th congress. Primarily the Communists who recognized the program adopted at the 20th congress and the ideas of an independent Communist Party of Estonia and a sovereign Estonia. Those who supported these decisions have registered with the Communist Party of Estonia, and large numbers have at the same time quit the CPSU.

The second part, which has not recognized the Communist Party of Estonia Program, but which has not conducted a struggle against it, has taken shape mainly from the party organizations of the northeast of Estonia. These two groupings have constituted the so-called coalition Central Committee and its Bureau and Secretariat. It should be said that the coalition has proven highly efficient. In the time that has elapsed since the 20th Communist Party of Estonia Congress we have not adopted a single decision which has been pushed through by automatic majority. On the contrary, all decisions have been adopted on the basis of consensus. All this has taken time and has reduced the operational immediacy of our work somewhat. Nonetheless, we deemed it necessary to adhere strictly to this principle. This has been appreciated, I believe, locally, in the party organizations of northeast Estonia, and other regions also. As long as cooperation within the coalition framework was successful, we felt that, despite the reduced party membership and despite the offensive of anticommunism, we could in the republic's political life retain the position of left alternative and serve as a bridge between the two communities speaking different languages. In a word, perform the role in the name of which the coalition was created.

A few words about the third school. All these months we have been extremely tolerant of the activity of the party organ led by Comrades Gusev and Panfilov. True, we have at the same time declared that an arbitrary assembly of Communists—even if a group of delegates—does not have the authority to call itself a congress of the Communist Party of Estonia and adopt political decisions on behalf of the Communist Party of Estonia. The main concern of the said party structure and, particularly, its leaders was to win official recognition. A convincing example of this is the speech of Comrade Gusev at the CPSU Central Committee October 1990 Plenum.

Some Communists believe that we should from the very outset have adhered to different tactics and rebuffed each blow aimed at us. We deliberately have not done so. Primarily because we have not believed it possible for ourselves to descend to the level of squabbles. Estonia is approaching catastrophe, and the communists are fighting among themselves for power in a party which has lost real power. What might such a party look like?

So if we have not conducted an open struggle against this party organ, which also calls itself the Communist Party of Estonia Central Committee, it has not been on account of our helplessness but primarily because of sober political calculation. The Communist Party of Estonia Central Committee Bureau understands that such tactics, the sole ones possible for us, have at the same time made the relations of many party organizations with the nonparty masses quite awkward, and the party activists defenseless in the face of communists' anger. However, we believe that the positions we have thus preserved are more appreciable than these embarrassments.

At the 28th CPSU Congress we took a considerable step forward along the path of transformation of the CPSU into a union of parties. Of course, the CPSU is still not a real union of parties, the speaker observed, but movement in this direction has already begun. The development of events throughout the Soviet Union has to be considered also. It is for this reason, the speaker said, that the political ground has begun to slip from under the feet of the leaders of that part the press has called the "nocturnal party."

However, they have received assistance. It came opportunely and from an unexpected quarter. The first step in this respect was taken by "Kaitseliit" with its action involving the border posts. A part was played also by the government's decisions concerning the establishment of an economic border and price rises. All these steps strongly consolidated the Russian community. The prospect of being cut off from Russia, being left on this side

of the border with its quite uncertain political rights, and of finding itself under the arbitrary action of the government with its unpredictable behavior put the question of party affairs in a different light. There suddenly came to the forefront in the intraparty split, which had occurred **not on national but on political grounds,** the communal interests of the Russian-speaking population. It is perfectly clear that there has not been nor is there a party which defends these interests other than the Communist Party. It is understandable also that the everyday consciousness sees in the role of this defender the CPSU, as the leading party of the former Soviet Union and Russia. Whence also the support for the slogan: "For the Ideological and Organizational Unity of the CPSU."

The speaker emphasized that it is the communal interests of the Russian-speaking population which are to a considerable extent impeding the emergence in Estonia of the anticommunist mood typical of other regions. In the everyday consciousness of the Russian community, anticommunism is connected with Estonians' aspiration to state independence.

The leadership of the Gusev-Panfilov party structure hastened to take advantage of the situation in their own interests. In a word, the speaker observed, it is a question not of communism or socialism, not of ideology at all. It is a question of the national interests of the Russian community in the sense in which they are presented by some of its leaders and assimilated by the majority of this part of Estonia's population. From this viewpoint it is essential to evaluate also the behavior of the Russian-speaking communists who are participants in the coalition and who, naturally, cannot take the path of internal division of the Russian community. And we cannot ask the impossible here.

This development of events shows that the split in the party is moving with us truly in the direction in which people aspired to move it from the very outset, namely, toward national soil. But have we to acknowledge that for seven months we have idled, trying to preserve the Communist Party of Estonia as the last connecting bridge between the two communities? To both these questions we confidently answer no. What has happened has not been in vain. What distinguishes the Russian-speaking communists who are our coalition comrades? The clear understanding that we all live in Estonia together and that the Estonian people's aspiration to their own statehood is natural, but that following the achievement of statehood, all those who wish to live here should be assured all rights.

What distinguishes our opponents, those who support the Gusev-Panfilov Central Committee? The strict demand that the Estonian people renounce their cherished aspirations and an incapacity for understanding that the times when some people could impose their will, tastes, language, or customs on the Estonian people by force have gone. I believe that such a policy, the speaker observed, will lead those supporting it to political isolation, focus national enmity on themselves, and destabilize the situation throughout society.

It would be a good thing were everyone to have an equally clear understanding that the Estonian people's aspiration to freedom cannot simply be banned or recognized as inessential. But it cannot be forgotten that a sovereign Estonia also will remain multinational. We and our children will have to live here. And we and our children should be able to look one another in the eye without fear or mistrust of one another.

On what are we building cooperation with the different organizations of the Communist Party of Estonia or, as we have been saying until now, our coalition partners? Until recently these principles were not clearly formulated, and this also gave rise to misunderstanding among the communists. What, in fact, does this coalition represent? On 22 October the Communist Party of Estonia Central Committee Bureau conclusively determined the basis on which the coalition would unite. These principles are as follows:

The Estonian people, like any other, have a right to self-determination, at the level of their own statehood included. This means that the Estonian people's aspiration to statehood is justified and right.

The real achievement of state independence is a difficult and contradictory process, for which, together with the legal foundations, the creation of a firm economic and social base is essential.

In Estonia economic, social, and political rights are enjoyed not only by Estonians but the entire population permanently resident in Estonia. This means that all persons who permanently reside in Estonia, regardless of their national affiliation, have a right to participate in the solution of questions of the future political arrangement of the Estonian state.

The Republic of Estonia, whose economy is 97 percent dependent on the Eastern market and the raw material resources located there, has an interest in participation in the economic market of the USSR.

Taking account of the decisions of the 20th Communist Party of Estonia Congress and the 28th CPSU Congress and, particularly, the increasing need to really actively defend the interests of the working people, the 21st Communist Party of Estonia Congress will aim at the organizational structuring of an independent Communist Party of Estonia with members recognizing its program and rules. The congress will also formulate forms of cooperation with the renovating Communist Parties of other republics and the principles of relations with the CPSU.

Estonia Not To Coordinate Plans With Moscow

914A0156 Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in Russian 9 Nov 90 p 1

[Article by ETA correspondent I. Lindsalu: "The Prime Minister Again at Work"]

[Text] The state of the Estonian economy in 1991 was discussed at yesterday's meeting of the government. The traditional annual plan is no longer compiled. At a news conference Minister Jaak Leimann referred to the Ministry of Economics report as a "relatively realistic descriptive forecast." The government is now proceeding from an optimistic scenario, but at the same time it is ready for to accept that we will not be able to conclude agreements with the USSR and its departments that are appropriate for us.

Last Saturday, Edgar Savisaar met in Moscow with N. Ryzhkov in an attempt to arrive at the conclusion of an economic agreement between the USSR and Estonia as two states possessing equal rights. E. Savisaar assured journalists that the Estonian Republic will not pay a Union tax next year. Also, no planning documents will be sent to Moscow for coordination. Nonetheless, an exchange of draft purchase-sale agreements with the USSR was conducted, as was done by Latvia and Lithuania.

In addition, it was reported at the news conference that the government will submit a proposal to the Estonian Republic Supreme Soviet to begin to transfer shale extraction and processing enterprises, and also "Estonenergo," to the jurisdiction of the Estonian Republic. Starting with the new harvest (and if necessary, with the beginning of the new year), state purchase prices for grain will be raised.

Naturally, the journalists did not pass over the question of the statement of seven politicians that caused a sensation. E. Savisaar said he did not consider it necessary to comment on a situation where eight private individuals get together and give one of them the authority to form a new government. A change in the government is a matter for the Supreme Soviet. The prime minister added that, in his opinion, the undertaking of the eight politicians will not help substantially to broaden the social base of a government, in that the signatories themselves are part of an organization whose social base is continuously getting smaller. "The base of the Estonian Communist Party is continuously narrowing, the best days of the Congress of Estonia are a thing of the past, and the democratic association "Free Estonia" will soon be transformed into a golf club," commented Mr. Savisaar.

Presidential Candidate on Independence Efforts

AU0312120590 Hamburg DIE WELT in German 3 Dec 90 p 6

[Interview with Estonian presidential candidate Tunne Kelam, chairman of the Council of Estonia and member of the National Independence Party, by Andreas Engel; place and date not given: "We Do Not Need Gorbachev"]

[Text] [Engel] How do you achieve Estonian independence?

[Kelam] I suggest using a legal way to do this. You know, there is an elementary difference between the Baltic states and the other states of the Russian confederation. We do not need to declare our independence again, because it was declared already in 1918. This is still internationally recognized. Our situation can be compared with that of Norway and Denmark during the occupation by Nazi troops. What we have to achieve now is historical continuity, the reestablishment of our legal institutions, as they existed before the Soviet occupation.

[Engel] You need Gorbachev. Are you not endangering his position?

[Kelam] We do not need Gorbachev. We see ourselves as an independent nation. We also do not intend to interfere in the domestic affairs of the Soviet Union. We only want to make the relations between Moscow and the Baltic states clear in order to be recognized by the Soviet Government. Furthermore, Moscow must withdraw its troops from our country.

[Engel] In what way would the reestablishment of Estonia's sovereignty be useful for Moscow?

[Kelam] Estonia's independence may help Gorbachev to push ahead the process of democratization he has started. We could then take over the role of mediator between the West and the Soviet Union. In my view, the real revolution in Russia started long ago. It is obviously the result of a process the end of which will be the formation of various independent states.

[Engel] Do you expect help from Germany?

[Kelam] We accept any kind of help to free ourselves from Soviet rule. Living conditions have clearly deteriorated. Prices are rising. It will be a hard winter.

[Engel] Do you envisage membership in the Council of Europe?

[Kelam] This could be a first step to reintegrate the Baltic states into the European system. But we are still under Soviet occupation. Our main problem is to get rid of the Army. An enormous contingent of troops is stationed in our country; the West is not really aware of its strength. The troops consist of 200,000 men for a population of 1.6 million.

[Engel] What role does the KGB play in Estonia?

[Kelam] It puts us under massive pressure. Legally, we must not talk about our struggle for independence. Therefore, we must manage to stop the activities of the KGB as quickly as possible. We will proceed with

nonviolent tactics, which is a speciality of the Baltic nations. We must make it clear that we do not hate the Russians but that the Soviet Government uses us as toys. Our main enemy is totalitarianism.

Estonian Party Property Conflict Continues

91UN0446A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 1 Dec 90 p 4

[Unattributed report under the rubric "News That Has Just Arrived!": "How Is the Affair To Be Resolved?"]

[Text] Almost a month has passed since RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA reported that the Bureau of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee registered a protest in the republic's Supreme Soviet in conjunction with the decision of the government to transfer to the balance sheet of the state the complex of buildings which previously housed the Political Education Home of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee.

The results of an inspection by a special governmental commission of sources for the financing of these facilities served as the basis for the government's decision to nationalize the former Political Education Home as well as plans to determine the further ownership of buildings and structures on the balance sheet of the CPSU and the Estonian Communist Party. The commission established that funds from the state budget, including the republic's hard currency fund, had been widely used in the construction of the buildings.

In order to resolve the dispute between the Bureau of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee and the government of the republic, A. Ruutel, chairman of the Estonian Supreme Soviet, intended to "talk about it" with E.-A. Sillari, member of CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the coalition Central Committee of the Estonian Communist Party, and E. Savisaar, prime minister of the republic, and try to "resolve the matter" together.

However, as E.-A. Sillari reported to a TASS correspondent, the conversation with the head of the parliament on this subject did not take place. The question of the nationalization of party property, said the first secretary of the coalition Central Committee of the Estonian Communist Party, was reviewed within the government. Because of the delicacy of the question, it was decided there to pass it on for review by the Presidium of the republic's Supreme Soviet for adoption of a "political solution." E.-A. Sillari proposes that the government of the republic become joint owner of the party publishing house. He believes that a joint-stock company may be created for that. As for the Political Education Home, the ownership of which is disputed, by decision of the leadership of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee it is already functioning as a "fully independent cultural center."

Letter to Gorbachev Decries Center's Viewpoint

91UN0446B Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in Russian 20 Nov 90 p 1

["Open Letter to President of the USSR M.S. Gorbachev"—SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA headline]

[Text] Deeply respected Mikhail Sergeyevich!

In this time that is so tense and worrisome for the country you lead, I wish to address you not as the minister for interethnic relations of the Republic of Estonia but as a Russian living in Estonia.

The Republic of Estonia, like all of the Soviet Union, is going through a difficult time. We too are threatened by the grip of a general economic crisis, great ecological problems, and very complex interethnic relations. However we, as opposed to an alarmed USSR Supreme Soviet, do not consider our situation to be incurably catastrophic. Take, for example, interethnic relations. The central organs of the mass media have expended much printing ink describing them in the darkest of tones and ensuring that the black would also cover our region on the demographic landscape of the Union. By way of argument I will cite you only one fact. Instances of physical clashes on grounds of interethnic or political discord are almost unheard-of in our republic at present. Both the Estonians and the numerous non-Estonians living here are offended and even insulted by the misrepresentation of facts by the center or, at the least, the center's willingness to consider the society in our republic ripe for violence and hence approaching the point of requiring the adoption of extraordinary administrative measures on the part of the center. The fact that we are travelling a particularly nonviolent path to the state independence of Estonia is a credit to Estonians and the non-Estonian part of the population alike. I am hardly saying that all the problems of interethnic relations have been resolved here. That would be dishonest. But at the same time I wish to say decisively to you and to the USSR Supreme Soviet that we are in need of neither rescuing nor punishing. You can peacefully apply that portion of your energies that you have freed for us to another sphere of your most important state activity. I assure you that the harshness of our political struggle and of our public speeches is at the level of Scandinavian standards and noticeably lower than the average European level.

A definite plus for us is our ability to learn from mistakes and study reality. The Estonian and Russian-speaking communities observe one another intently and this does not permit them to ignore their mutual interests.

Lately from the quarter of radically minded ethnic forces there have appeared compromise proposals with regard to citizenship and the civil rights of residents of a future independent Estonia. I personally am inspired by this to further effort on the construction of a civil society in our republic. We are working very hard to decentralize power, increase the role of the local organs, and create

conditions favorable to the birth of structures of self-administration. The tax laws and draft bills of our republic sufficiently favor the appearance and development of economic initiative, especially in the realm of foreign economic activities. As a result, the desire of the old center to keep everything under its strict control and treat all the republics alike is contrary to our aspirations. I would like to believe that the fundamental reorganization of the executive power at the center proposed by you in your speech to the USSR Supreme Soviet on 17 November 1990 will make the center not more strict but rather more democratic with regard to us. I wish to emphasize that the establishment of barriers on the path of the natural development of Estonia will only complicate its domestic political situation.

Our development does not threaten anyone. The majority of our inhabitants want the republic to have equal partnership relations with all the other republics independent of whether they form a new Union or not.

Sovereignty and independence also mean the opportunity for the republic to live by its wits. Perestroyka and democratization have presented the individual with the same opportunity. In our republic there are increasingly more people who are ready for the new way of life. In your 17 November 1990 speech you specifically addressed yourself to the communists. Does this mean that we must again have the misfortune of returning to their "wise leadership"? Have the old methods of political rule not completely discredited themselves? Permit me to remind you that in our republic the Communist Party has voluntarily repudiated its monopoly on power.

I hope that a return to the past is impossible and that the great perestroyka that you have begun will not come to a halt under the harsh applause of right-wingers. Permit me once more to offer my respect to you and to wish you health and success on the path to the development of democracy.

Respectfully,
[Signed] A. Kuznetsov

Non-Estonians Oppose Tallinn Housing Law Reforms

Restrictions Protested

91UN0461A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 8 Dec 90 pp 2-3

[Part one of article by RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA correspondent S. Tarakanov under the rubric "Letter From Estonia": "'Our People' and 'Aliens'"]

[Text] Tallinn—**I will say right off that I was prompted to reach for my pen by the racket which the Press Commission of the republic legislature made concerning the note by A. Yurkin, "People Without a Future," received by the editorial office through TASS channels and published in PRAVDA. An appeal by the parliamentary commission to Editor in Chief of PRAVDA "Mister Frolov" said that certain central publications have mounted an hysterical campaign with regard to Estonia, the objective of which is to frustrate or call into doubt the negotiations with the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic]. The very attempt to portray all Russian people residing in Estonia as people without a future does not bear criticism, and may aggravate interethnic relations which are difficult to begin with.** *We cannot say that the issues of the Russian-speaking populace are not discussed in Estonia. They are discussed and even argued about. The voice of the "pro-Estonian" mass media is coming across louder than those of others. However, they frequently paint a rosy picture of the situation.*

However, what if a man, regardless of his ethnic background, indeed needs little to be happy, that is, to live a normal life? Let us look at how and by what means such a life is ensured in Estonia?

"'Get Out of Here!'—Under the Law?"

This is how 13 chairmen of the trade union committees of the largest enterprises of the capital city entitled their letter to MOLODEZH ESTONII on the occasion of the adoption of the 16 August resolution of the city soviet "On Restrictions on the Allocation of Housing in Tallinn." In this document, the city authorities are instructed to confirm the allocation of apartments and issue move-in vouchers only to persons who have been registered and have resided in Estonia for 25 years or since their date of birth, and the last 10 years must have been in Tallinn.

The outraged trade union leaders argued quite reasonably that from now on people with shorter terms of residency in Estonia than the one established will be deprived of the legal right to have shelter and to improve their housing conditions. In practice, the implementation of this resolution of the city soviet means the need to take two-thirds of the enterprise employees on the waiting lists for apartments off those lists.

Another 35 trade union leaders from Tallinn enterprises, representing the interests of more than 50,000 trade union members and their families, joined the protest of "the thirteen." Indignation snowballed and finally reached the Presidium of the republic Supreme Soviet. As a result, a decree came to life. It did not repeal the gorispolkom [city executive committee] resolution. It found that the resolution was in compliance with the provisions of the previously adopted resolution of the old Council of Ministers and Trade Union Council of the republic—"On Carrying Out in Tallinn an Experiment Involving the Registration and Allocation of Residential Premises to Citizens in Need of Improving Housing Conditions." It also complied with a projection for implementing the housing program by the year 2000 worked out by the city soviet two years ago. The city authorities were instructed make a clarification to their resolution "which would rule out an opportunity to interpret its individual provisions variously." The substantiation of the need to adopt such a decree was

interesting. It "is aimed at alleviating the inequality in allocating residential space to the native residents of Tallinn which has existed for decades." Let us note that this is a good intention. As is known, however, it is precisely with such intentions that the road is paved to a certain place which frightens our souls.

It is common knowledge that the notorious extensive development was the cause of inequality in the allocation of housing to those who are citizens of Tallinn by birth. As a result of this development, the structure of the indigenous population was distorted, and its flow from the productive to the non-productive sphere occurred. Newly created and expanded enterprises tapped outside labor. They were forced to vigorously build housing with their own resources in order to develop normally.

Such was the reality of our recent past. Now they are segregating the citizens of Tallinn into "our people" and "aliens" instead of looking for an opportunity to expand housing construction and repairs. From this point of view, a letter from city soviet Chairman Andres Kork to MOLODEZH ESTONII is instructive. It is accompanied by statistical data, broken down by year, which are intended to prove that the 16 August resolution does not discriminate against the Russian populace because between 1983 and 1987 Estonians accounted for 32 percent of those who received state apartments, and for an even smaller percentage of those who received cooperative apartments.

Let us be reasonable, however, and let us not delve into numbers which put the multinational populace of Tallinn on different sides of the barricade. Before we embark on analyzing the consequences of such acts by the powers that be, let us consider, as they do, that all kinds of international pacts on the freedom of movement and residence do not apply to us. They are for more civilized people. In addition, there is a demographic crisis in Estonia. Estonians account for slightly over 60 percent of the population in the republic. So-called migrants account for the lion's share of the rest. Their increasing number is acknowledged here to pose a real threat to the existence of the Estonian nation.

Normative acts, to which references are made in the decree, should have become a barrier to migration, but so far they have not. Later, registration quotas for all administrative-territorial units appeared. Practice has shown, however, that they have been exceeded as well. At that point, the city fathers of Tallinn came up with a resolution whose brazenness would impress many well-known dictators. Not all of them would have dared to apply a law retroactively. Judging by the appeals and letters of our readers, this activity has manifested itself, to be sure, in combination with the decisions to restrict registrations which the authorities had made earlier.

Esteemed reader, let us divide these complaints into groups based on the sad similarity of situations.

Here is a letter from fisherman Anatoliy Svadkovskiy. After he graduated from the Kronshtadt School of Maritime Navigation, he was assigned to Tallinn, to auxiliary vessels of the Navy. He put in the appointed three years and transferred to a fishing collective farm. In 1981, he was placed on a waiting list for a cooperative apartment. Seven years later, a long-awaited notice of the allocation of a three-room apartment to his family of four arrived. Their joy was premature, however. Construction personnel failed them. Instead of the first quarter of 1989, facility No. 53 was commissioned in June of this year. The author of the letter headed to the gorispolkom to get his move-in voucher; after all, he had paid his down payment on the apartment as long as two years ago, and... he came away empty-handed because his family resided in Klaypeda. Meanwhile, the family, having heard about the allocation of the move-in vouchers, signed out of the apartment where they lived, and the house in Tallinn, where the head of the family lived, was demolished.

A. Svadkovskiy writes: "Fifteen years of labor have been given to the republic, and hard labor at that (eight to nine months a year at sea). Furthermore, it was not just my labor but also that of others. Another nine families are in a similar situation at our ill-fated facility No. 53." Subsequently, he recalls one of the provisions of the Republic of Estonia Law on Immigration which says that in the course of regulating family migration the reunification of families and the preservation of their integrity is facilitated, and asks: Where is justice and logic in the decision of the gorispolkom?

There is logic, but we will reflect on it later. For now, there is one more letter overflowing with vexation and the desire not to get in trouble.

"I, Lyudmila Ivanova—I am not using my real name deliberately—was born and grew up in Tallinn. On 9 February 1990, I got married. My husband is from Pskov Oblast. I have a one-room apartment, but they are not registering him. In the Morskoy Rayon Executive Committee, they did not even explain the reason for refusing to do so."

Many others are also fighting for the legitimate reunification of their families under one roof. This is what worker of SU-5 [Construction Administration-5] of the Tallinnstroy Trust, Reyn Leydla, told us about his woes:

"Previously, I and my wife Lena were permanently registered in Tallinn. It so happened that my spouse's father got seriously sick, and we were forced to live in Saratov for a year. In March 1986, we came back. They gave me a room in a dormitory with registration. They did not register Lena, my son, and my daughter, citing the size of my residential space. Then the management of the trust sent a letter to the gorispolkom stating that one more room was being allocated to me, but we were turned down once again. For more than four years the people who are dear to me have been left up in the air. The latest resolution of the gorispolkom altogether robs

me of hope for a better future. Life has become altogether unbearable. Without registration, Lena cannot get a job and receive coupons for foodstuffs for herself and the children, nor can she receive compensation pay. She is under a constant threat of being fined for violating passport regulations."

Incidentally, the rest of the people mentioned here also suffer similar privation.

Perhaps servicemen and their families are in the most difficult situation. Resolution of the republic government No. 384, dated 22 November 1989, which contravenes an analogous Union document, became fateful in their case. The resolution gives the right to register only to those discharged or retiring from the USSR Armed Forces who were permanent residents of Estonia before joining the service. As we were told at the republic military commissariat, as of 1 January of this year 166 families of former servicemen were on the waiting lists for housing. It is easy to surmise that at present prospects for allocation of housing in Tallinn are nil. Frequently, the people find themselves in utterly ridiculous situations, as was the case with Lt.Col. Yuriy Golubovich who was discharged due to personnel reductions this March. He has an apartment provided by the Ministry of Defense, but he has no passport. He has not been issued one because he is not entitled to be registered in the republic permanently.

Yu. Golubovich said: "I do not intend to live in Estonia. All I need is a passport in order to go to my native area. Incidentally, over there I have already been placed on a waiting list for an apartment. They have been helpful, unlike the local authorities."

The local authorities continue to be difficult. Due to the holding of an unauthorized military parade on 7 November by the Tallinn garrison, the city soviet suspended the resolution of current issues associated with the stay of the USSR Armed Forces in Tallinn until the Tallinn garrison recognizes the city authorities. It is understood that housing issues are included in this.

So far, we have been talking about the letter of the laws and the resolutions. Now is the time to mention clarifications which the gorispolkom was supposed to provide in keeping with the instructions of the Supreme Soviet Presidium. This is what the expanded communique "Specifics on the 16 August Resolution" published by VECHERNIY TALLINN suggested. It turned out that this decision does not apply to the citizens of Tallinn who were confirmed as members of housing cooperatives prior to 16 August or whose turn for the allocation of an apartment has already been confirmed. It was also explained that citizens of Tallinn who have lived in the city for less than the appointed period will remain on the waiting list. Nobody intends to strike them off the list.

As they say, a legend may be new, but it is hard to believe because these clarifications contravene not only the resolution itself, but also registration quotas and other restrictive measures. Grounds for conflict remain; a lot is left to the discretion of local officials. The people feel that they are not protected against the possible and actual arbitrariness of the latter. There have already been cases of unauthorized contributors [to cooperative housing projects] moving into cooperative apartments.

Incidentally, as the newspaper noted in the aforementioned communique, Mr. Kirill Teyter offered interesting arguments at a gorispolkom meeting: Restrictions are not necessary at all. Nobody is going to be given an apartment anyway within the next 10 to 15 years. The scope of housing construction is being reduced abruptly. Those whose dwellings are unfit for occupancy or have been damaged by natural disasters will be given apartments.

The words of the deputy are not far removed from our present-day reality. The question is: Why go to all the trouble then? Who needs to steadily make registration and residency requirements more stringent? Finally, are there some political interests behind this? One must conclude by oneself that there are political interests if we look at all the restrictive measures as a system. It also has additional structures. Thus, incentives have appeared to move outside the boundaries of the republic. For example, depending on the standard of the apartment turned in, one may receive R500 [rubles] per square meter (in October, the rate was R200). It is considerably higher in the black market. This is why the city soviet is now developing a plan to hold apartment auctions.

Let us consider this method a carrot. A stick comprises the bans we already know about plus one more restriction introduced in the summer of this year. This has to do with the per capita standard of residential space during exchanges: nine square meters for those who were citizens of Estonia prior to 1940, 12 square meters for those who previously lived in Tallinn for 10 years at one time or another, and 15 square meters for intercity exchanges. In all of this, the sanitary norm of eight square meters per person has not been canceled in the city. If we take into account the fact that the useful space of a three-room apartment in a standard house amounts to between 40 and 44 square meters and no fewer than three people live there, direct intercity exchanges without additional combinations inside the city become virtually unrealistic.

The thrust of creating such laws is obvious, but solving the housing problems of the natives of Tallinn by means of it is a utopia. When someone has put down roots on the land of Estonia, he cannot be convinced that it is better to build his life and exercise his rights on another territory. The people will still strive to reunite their families regardless of the uncontrollable growth of prices for foodstuffs and other circumstances.

Ethnic Differences Examined

91UN0461B Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 9 Dec 90 p 2

[Second and last part of article by RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA correspondent S. Tarakanov under the rubric "Letter From Estonia": "A Poor Man Cannot Be Free"]

[Text] Tallinn—One wave after another of reports about ever new price increases entailed by the cancellation of subsidies and growing prices for raw and other materials, equipment, machinery, and energy resources keeps hitting the residents of Estonia. Using public transit became more expensive. Effective 15 October, prices increased by factors ranging between 1.6 and 2.7 for baked goods, food concentrates, flour, cereals, meat, milk, and products manufactured from them.

Subsequently, confectioneries, gasoline, household services, and car servicing became more expensive. Payments for electricity and fuel will be going up in the new year. Let us add to this so-called contract prices and the disappearance of cheap goods, astronomical price tags in commercial and used-goods stores, trade for hard currency only, and the situation of the residents of the Estonian land will become clear without any economic analysis. We cannot do without the latter, however.

First of all, we should say that, in conjunction with the cancellation of subsides for fish, meat, and dairy products, the government will pay R84 [rubles] for the 2.5 months before the end of the year to children, school and college students, mothers on maternity leaves, retirees who do not work, and those who support themselves by monthly state benefits. In addition, minimal retirement benefits and childbirth benefits have been increased, and one-time grants in aid are practiced. This combined movement of social logistics, however, is falling hopelessly behind the onslaught of prices. This is confirmed by the declining use of more expensive foodstuffs and by predictions by the government cabinet of E. Savisaar. For example, Minister for Social Issues Leonhard Tammin stated that by the end of next year the living standard of the people will drop by a factor of two compared to the current level. The growth rates for this year are as follows: The incomes of the residents of the land of Estonia increased by 28 percent whereas prices increased by 75 percent. In other words, the standard of living dropped by 40 percent, or 1.4 times. There is no arrangement for permanent compensation. For now there are merely ideas about its introduction.

How does the government's "shock therapy" affect the people? Here is an example from the stream of public opinion. Author Nasta Pino writes in EDAZI: "The current Estonian Government is not encouraging the people to work better and create new assets, but to sell as expensively as possible what little we have. The policy pursued is seemingly attractive: To receive more money for less labor. Who will turn this down? This sabotages Estonian diligence which has taken centuries to evolve. Why did we not begin with perestroyka in the economy, with a concern for producing more efficiently and cheaply? Is this not the foundation of a market economy? Why did we begin with prices?

"I do not have dollars and Finnish markkaa. All I have are 'wooden rubles.' I am extremely short of these as well. The entire life of culture employees consists of continuously fighting off poverty. Hunger is looming large for us now. A cold winter lies ahead, and I know that if, God forbid, I get sick, there will be no medicine in the drugstores. At the same time, a power struggle is flaring up in Toompea (the government palace and the hall of the Supreme Soviet—note by S. Tarakanov). The People's Front has very quickly turned into a front of military commanders who have no time for the people anymore! Being 'the children of communism,' they recognize just the one and only truth of their own. The main point for them is their struggle, the suppression of dissidence and the creation of still new programs for the execution of which no energy remains. Too many people are now milling around on the bridge. Having found themselves in the corridors of power, they forget that they have promised the people independence and a better life."

Undoubtedly, the article in EDAZI is emotional. Let me note that such articles are becoming increasingly numerous, and the names of authors indicate different ethnic backgrounds. This is why, to my mind, a sociological survey of national peculiarities in attitudes toward price increases is interesting; it was carried out under the supervision of Andrus Saar, director of the Journalism Information Center. I will cite some of the conclusions by sociologists and the numbers which support them. They find that assertions by some political figures and scientists to the effect that a majority of the populace support the cancellation of subsidies and increased prices for meat and dairy products are not quite right. Fifty percent of the Estonians and 16 percent of the Russian-speaking populace supported the relevant government draft fully or partially; 23 and 65 percent respectively came out against it.

Ethnic differences on the issue of prices are obvious. What is the explanation?

Sociologists believe that the roots of divergent opinions are found in the ideological orientations widespread in the two ethnic groups, but "not in the form which is usually meant," that is, in ideological opposition. They believe that the Estonian people have a supreme goal—creating their own state. They are prepared to sacrifice some of their material welfare for the sake of this. There is no such unifying idea in the case of non-Estonians; they are also uncertain about the place they will occupy in the future Estonian state.

The evaluations by the two groups of their own material welfare at similar income levels do not coincide either. Among the non-Estonians, those who believe that they have enough money only for the most necessary daily expenses are twice as numerous, and those who lack

money for the most necessary things are three times as numerous. What is the reason for this dissimilarity? In the opinion of sociologists, it is found in both the objective and subjective peculiarities of the way of life of this group. Thus, an overwhelming majority of the Russian-speaking populace live in the cities; unlike Estonians, they have no relatives in rural areas. Under the current economic conditions, the rural areas provide powerful material and moral support for the urbanites. The Russian-speaking residents have to rely only on themselves. Their apprehensions become understandable.

The researchers maintain that one more reason is found in ethnic character traits; in this instance, we should give the researchers their due for courage. I will not venture a judgment on the correctness of the characterization of these traits, because I believe that they are not the foremost and definitive, but rather that they affect the behavior of people in a certain way. Nonetheless, I believe that we should dwell on these conclusions as well, and if need be take issue with them.

I will begin with the summary conclusion of the study. It suggests that following price increases the representatives of the Russian-speaking populace will be in a worse situation, because the Estonians are better prepared than the Russians for price increases and, in general, for life under new economic conditions due to certain national character traits and objective conditions of life. The question is why. Because the Estonians tend to seek higher-paying jobs and engage in individual labor, including in the countryside, more vigorously than the Russians. The Russians opt more frequently for a passive way out of the situation—reducing consumption of the now more expensive foodstuffs, or active protest—through the press and at rallies, all the way to strikes.

I will not search for objections to these conclusions. I will only try to sketch out what the reference to the objective conditions of life conceals. Therefore, what stands in the way of a more vigorous search for higher-paying jobs by the Russians? The main barrier is language. Without the knowledge of the state language, meeting higher categories of requirements is more difficult, and one has a snowball's chance in hell of joining the highly-paid state official service and other services, diving into the sea of entrepreneurship where records should be kept in Estonian, taking up research and instruction work at colleges and research facilities, or becoming a creative artist within the scope of the republic, because the government does not ensure the study of the state language.

The issue of citizenship is a second obstacle. The drafts and political views of various parties available to date do not assure non-Estonians that their interests are going to be safeguarded in the process of de-state-ization of public property and its privatization. Therefore, they have little use for such citizenship.

The third problem is the lack of belief by many people in the final results of the reforms being implemented by the leadership of the republic which, in the opinion of politicians from the Russian-speaking community, proceed from the aspiration to create an ethnocratic state. The failure of a program called upon to be a miracle ensuring the prosperity of the people is an argument in favor of this disbelief. Many Estonians have swallowed this fact in silence in the name of the triumph of a national idea; however, no smaller a segment of the rest of the community stopped believing the top echelon of the republic, especially after the authors of the program admitted publicly that it was a political action to clear the way toward state independence rather than an economic action.

Finally, the Russian population has begun to master the skill of discerning the political underpinnings of the apparently economic measures of the government. This has been particularly vividly manifested in the still unsettled conflict in the northeastern part of the republic over an attempt to implement there a law on the economic border which transcends greatly the framework suggested by its name and limits the freedom of movement not only of freight but also of some individuals. This conflict has already transcended the framework of an intrarepublic conflict because the border cities and oblasts of the FSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] have also been drawn into it. At present, its consequences are hard to predict.

As I see it, it is up to you, the reader, whether to agree with this or not. It is precisely these issues rather than the features of the Russian character that are the basis for an active protest by the multinational non-Estonian population of the republic. In addition, it appears that fewer and fewer Estonians are willing to sacrifice their benefits for the sake of pie in the sky, and to be poor but free. The probable reason is that the absurdity of such an appeal is visible to the naked eye; after all, a poor man cannot be free. A money bag will always come about who will put a yoke on him and strap him to his team. There are also signs that politicians are beginning to perceive this reality.

Enterprise Representatives Support Union Treaty

LD1612163190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1518 GMT 16 Dec 90

[Text] Even on Sunday the business of politics continues. In particular, a meeting has been held today in Tallinn in support of the Union treaty. Our correspondent Heimar Lenk reports:

[Begin recording] The majority of the organizers and participants in today's meeting are representatives of major industrial enterprises under Union jurisdiction in Tallinn and towns in eastern Estonia. To date, 97 percent of Estonian industry is closely tied to supplies from various republics of the Soviet Union. Industrialists see the conclusion of a new treaty as, at least, some sort of guarantee of resources and raw materials in the future. If one takes a broader view, everyone who came to today's meeting is concerned about the future of their collective,

their family, and their country. The idea of a sovereign Estonia, outside the USSR, is not the idea of those gathered here; they see the future of the republic only in a united family, as we only recently used to say.

One must not forget, however, that there are also quite a few people in the republic who throughout the years of perestroyka have fought for the full independence of Estonia. If the republic's Communists were unable to find a common language, and the Communist Party of Estonia split into two parts at the last congress, what can then be said about the people, who hear only promises from all sides. [end recording]

Living Standards Decline in Estonia

LD2311141490 Moscow TASS in English 1306 GMT 23 Nov 90

[By TASS correspondent Albert Maloveryan]

[Text] Tallinn November 23 TASS—The living standards in Estonia have declined by 40 per cent as compared to the beginning of the year. The fall was caused by continuous price hikes, which soared by 70-75 per cent over ten months, and a shortfall in the increase in wages, which amounted to 28 per cent.

According to forecasts by the republican Ministry for Social Issues, the people's living standards will fall by a factor of two as compared to the present level due to further increases in the costs of food, manufactured goods and services.

The ministry proposed elaborating a mechanism to compensate to the less socially-protected groups of the population—pensioners, invalids, children and workers in the non-production sphere. This should be a permanently operating mechanism, increasing incomes proportionally to the increase in the price index.

Presently, low-income groups are compensated only for expenditures incurred as a result of increases in the prices of meat, dairy products and some other foods in October. But local government bodies have not been re-calculating minimum pensions on time.

New Estonian Media Workers' Union Founded

LD1312233390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1810 GMT 13 Dec 90

[Text] Tallinn, 13 December. (ETA-TASS)—The extraordinary congress of the Estonian Union of Journalists which took place today in Tallinn ended its work by adopting regulations for a new trade union—the Estonian Press Workers Union. The new trade union has united all workers in the press, radio, and television, from drivers to journalists, with the exception of chief editors or directors who are employers according to the new regulations. A little earlier the heads of the republic's mass media had created a union of Estonian newspapers.

The aim of the new union is the defense of the social and professional interests of journalists. In the ever-widening market production and competition, in the opinion of the congress delegates who spoke, many journalists will become unemployed. The union should aid in regulating relations during editorial staff cuts, in hiring staff, in work by contract, and many other issues.

Chairman Elected

LD1712195890 Tallin Estonian Television Network in Estonian 1900 GMT 13 Dec 90

[Summary] The extraordinary congress of the Union of Journalists decided to rename the union as the Estonian Press Workers Union, with the Union of Journalists as a subdivision of the new organization. Mart Muur was elected chairman of the new union.

Strike Committee Supports Tallinn Garrison

LD1911234790 Moscow TASS in English 2147 GMT 19 Nov 90

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Kharchenko]

[Text] Tallinn November 20 TASS—The Estonian Council of Enterprise Strike Committees issued a statement on Monday supporting servicemen of the Tallinn garrison who held a parade in the Freedom Square on November 7 to mark the 73d anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. The parade was not sanctioned by the city authorities.

After the parade, the Tallinn city council passed a resolution postponing decisions on current issues connected with the stay of Soviet Armed Forces here, until the garrison recognises the city authorities.

The leadership of the Tallinn garrison demonstrated force to destabilise the political situation in Estonia and Tallinn, the resolution notes. The resolution fails to say that Tallinn garrison head Vice-Admiral Yuriy Belov implemented the Soviet president's decree.

The republican strike committee council stood up staunchly to protect servicemen and their families. "We have proposed that the city council think over possible consequences of the adopted decision for servicemen, workers and employees of the garrison and their families, who should enjoy full rights as city residents," Council Chairman Mikhail Lysenko said.

"We demand that the city council decision be reversed. Otherwise, the republican strike committee council does not eliminate the stirring up of activities by city work collectives to supporting the garrison," he said.

Latvia

Gorbunovs, Godmanis Cited on Talks With Russians

PM2711122590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Nov 90 Union Edition p 2

[Report by correspondent Irina Litvinova under the Direct Link" rubric: "Initial Results of Moscow Meeting"]

[Text] Riga— "We can breathe easier" is how local commentators are assessing the optimistic results of the Latvian leaders' meeting with top Russian officials.

In an interview republic Supreme Soviet Chairman A. Gorbunovs and Council of Ministers Chairman I. Godmanis pointed out that consultations on both political and economic questions were successful. A joint communique points out that the participants in the meeting came to the unanimous view that the state sovereignty of Latvia and Russia must be observed. The sides agreed that all questions relating to all-Union property will be covered by special agreements based on legislative enactments concerned with the defense of the fundamentals of economic sovereignty.

At the Moscow meeting it was agreed to expedite the elaboration and signing of a treaty between the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] and the Latvian Republic.

Latvian CP Congress Report, Debate Outlined

PM1112144990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Dec 90 Second Edition p 2

[Report by O. Meshkov under the "Yesterday, Today, Tomorrow" rubric: "Notes on the 25th Latvian Communist Party Congress; in Opposition but Not on the Margin"]

[Text] Almost eight months have passed since the evening in April when some of the delegates participating in the first sitting of the 25th Latvian Communist Party Congress staged a walkout from the hall as a sign of protest. It was then that the Latvian Communist Party—one of the oldest in the world communist movement—split. I must admit that I felt a pang as those people were leaving the hall—for with many of them we were linked by shared memories of heated comradely arguments and joint work. And so they quit. It was truly a shame that those who walked out were mainly representatives of the indigenous nationality.

We have to be frank about something else too: All of us who were left in the hall hoped that with the change in the Latvian Communist Party leadership and in the composition of the Central Committee, the party would finally become what the overwhelming majority of Latvian Communists would like it to be: a party that actively opposes attacks and onslaughts from our political opponents. The following also happened: Some people were in a hurry to say goodbye to the Latvian Communist Party, which they said was for the most part a party of only one nationality and as such would come to the end of its glorious history. This has not happened. Not yet. And it will not happen.

We were intimidated with the idea that the cream of the Latvian intelligentsia would leave the Communist Party. Indeed, the list of scientists, writers, artists who left our ranks was not particularly short, unfortunately. Those who did not follow their example were hounded and persecuted. But I cannot help admiring the courage and staunchness of these comrades—academician V. Shteynberg, doctor of sciences and lawyer V. Miller, economist S. Dimanis, and many others. On the eve of the final sitting of the congress, I visited the rural Bauskiy Party Raykom [rayon committee]. In this rayon, power is entirely in the hands of the People's Front—both in the rayon center and in the surrounding area. Communists have to operate practically illegally. What struck me was that the first secretary of the raykom is a very young man, young enough to be in the Komsomol [Lenin Communist Youth League]. In the past few days, a young woman who is a kolkhoz worker, a Latvian by nationality, was received into the party. Given that these are young people—and I feel sure that they are genuine young people who are not disillusioned with the Communist Party, and who are prepared to fight for its ideas in the toughest conditions—I think it means it is too early to give up the Latvian Communist Party as a hopeless case.

The third sitting of the congress was very well organized. At the press center, journalists (and around 60 organizations, news agencies, and publications were accredited at the congress) were presented with a great deal of information and many documents. They included one to which I would draw special attention: "On the Implementation of Proposals and Critical Observations Expressed at the First and Second Sittings of the 25th Latvian Communist Party Congress." How many times have we had to read similar documents—and often our eyes did not dwell on anything, but just skimmed over the lines and pages, as a great deal there was formal and nothing out of the ordinary. Here every paragraph means struggle, development, something that testifies more convincingly than anything to the party's vitality. That is why people believe in it. People place their hopes in it and try to support it.

Here are a few excerpts from this document. "Comrades Yu. Anton, Ya. Belyavniyeks, and F. Kuzmin proposed that concrete measures be taken to improve the party ranks and dissociate them from unhealthy forces in the party. Most of the rayon structures of the Latvian Communist Party were created between the first and second sittings of the congress. A scientific-practical conference of secretaries of the republic's primary party organizations has been held."

"A. Klautsen, V. Ivanov, A. Ozolinsh, and E. Smekhov proposed that a mechanism be elaborated to protect the autonomy of labor collectives and state ownership of enterprises and organizations under union jurisdiction. From June through September the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee Commission for Socioeconomic Policy carried out intensive work to draw up an economic concept for the production and economic activity of enterprises and organizations under union jurisdiction on Latvian territory, and to draw up documents on the creation in the republic of an intersectorial association for these enterprises and organizations. It was also aimed at the strengthening of the autonomy of labor collectives, the abolition of their dependence on central and republic departments, and the creation of joint stock companies at enterprises with 51 percent of the shares being transferred to the labor collectives' ownership. As a result of this work, the USSR Council of Ministers resolution 'On the Transformation of Union State Enterprises, Associations, and Organizations Located on the Territory of the Latvian SSR, into Joint Stock Companies' was adopted."

"A number of proposals concerned the creation of a working group, the elaboration and submission to the republic Supreme Soviet through Communist deputies of specific draft laws in the sphere of political and socioeconomic life. Communist deputies created the 'Equal Rights' faction in the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet, which is headed by S. Dimanis, member of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee."

A. Rubiks, first secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee and member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, gave a detailed report lasting almost two hours at the congress. He gave very harsh assessments of the political situation in the republic: A qualitatively new system has formed here which is hostile to socialism and the Communist Party and is openly in favor of the disintegration of the Soviet Union. "We have come to the final phase of the congress," the speaker said, "enriched with the experience of analyzing political processes that can be observed in the republic and with a general idea about what Communists should do today and how. Therefore the Central Committee sees as the main task at the final phase of the 25th Latvian Communist Party Congress the formation of party strategy for the period until it stops being the opposition and obtains the opportunity to participate in the formation of a government on a coalition basis." The material expression of the solution of this task was the Latvian Communist Party Action Program and its Statutes—the code of norms of party life and activity in the new conditions—adopted by the delegates. The Action Program adopted by the congress stresses that it constitutes the basic policy of a party that is now in opposition. This is a very important definition, which every Communist and every party link must consider in determining the scope and methods of resolving tasks. It was justly stressed that a thorough analysis of the political situation is needed now more than ever. We have to learn to keenly sense the changes taking place in the political situation in order to adjust course, strategy, and tactics in good time. This analysis of the disposition of forces and of the assessment of the main political opponent—the Latvian People's Front [LPF]—was made at the third sitting of the congress.

In three years, the LPF turned from a liberal-democratic movement into a national-radical organization. At its third congress, the LPF announced the incompatibility of the communist philosophy with participation in the movement. And by putting forward the slogan "Latvia—for the Latvians," the LPF has practically turned into a National Front of Latvia and has become an openly nationalistic formation.

What conclusion can be drawn from this? E. Eglit, secretary of the Latvian Maritime Steamship Company Party Committee, who spoke in the debate, supported the idea expressed by the speaker, to the effect that it is now very important to show the republic's electorate the concrete fruit of the work of the elected representatives of the people whom they voted into the soviets from the People's Front. The republic's economy is on the brink of collapse, interethnic hostility is increasing, and antidemocratic laws, resolutions, and decisions are being adopted at every step. And what is the position of the Communist deputies? Are they always aware of their party duty and do they fight against the adoption of antipopular laws that restrict the rights and freedoms of the individual? That is why it was proposed that a discussion of the positions of Communist deputies be organized and their reports heard.

Many people in Latvia are now asking themselves the following questions: What are we to do? Who will protect us from the tyranny of power? Maybe we should leave? But where would we go? The mass media are quick to suggest a way out of this situation: Leave! In this position they are indirectly linking themselves with the policy of the LPF, the Latvian National Independence Movement, and the Citizens Congress. The organs of executive power are sharply reducing housing construction, which is geared to the advice to leave. The Communist Party has different answers to these questions—you have to fight for your rights. And not just by setting your hopes on assistance from the center. A great deal can be achieved by using your own forces.

It was stated in the report: To get real results you have to try to create a governments on a coalition basis. Therefore we have to prepare for the upcoming elections right now. Delegates who spoke in debate have been supporting this appeal, sharing experience they have accumulated in the localities. Thus, Yu. Lyalin, first secretary of the Leningradskiy Party Raykom spoke about the fact that party okrugs were formed in the rayon in neighborhood units that have come into being through the years and in this way the territorial production principle can be observed, which may be of great significance in the upcoming election campaign.

The idea that it is necessary to strengthen cooperation with all genuinely democratic healthy forces in the republic was clearly voiced, particularly since the policy pursued by the current Supreme Soviet and its LPF majority provides many opportunities for this. Just consider the way the agrarian question was resolved. The government's plans to return the land to its former owners and the forced "decollectivization" are introducing instability and uncertainty into the lives of agricultural workers. Thinking about the moods of the rural community, Yevgeniya Yanovna Gusakova, first secretary of the Balvskiy Party Raykom, said that we have to strengthen cooperation with powerful organizations like the agrarian union.

Critical observations about the current Central Committee were also voiced on the rostrum. O. Zinchenko, member of the Baltic Military District Military Council, said that unfortunately at the moment the Central Committee has not managed to establish reliable contacts with the primary party organizations. Yu. Bogdanov, secretary of the party committee at the "Rizhskiy Mashinostroitelnyy Zavod" Production Association, said that he considers the fact that no one is concerned with the coordination of work of factions in the Latvian Communist Party in soviets at various levels to be a serious shortcoming. V. Voshchenko, a metal-worker at the Riga trawler fleet base spoke about the fact that we have to make persistent efforts to ensure that the "Equal Rights" faction holds talks with the LPF faction in the Supreme Soviet and with the republic Council of Ministers, regardless of the fact that the opponents are shying away from constructive dialogue.

The delegates to the congress have adopted an Action Program as well as the Latvian Communist Party Rules, the first point of which concerns the fact that the Latvian Communist Party is an autonomous political organization and it has its own program and normative documents, and it is part of the CPSU and organizes its activity on the basis of organizational and ideological unity with it.

Additional new members were elected to the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee. O.S. Shenin, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, participated in the work of the congress and delivered a speech.

Congress Assessed

91UN0438A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 6 Dec 90 p 2

[Report by RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA correspondent V. Proskura: "Not a Reserved Seat But a Fighter's Mandate; Epilogue of the Latvian Communist Party Congress"]

[Text] Riga—*The final session of the 25th Communist Party of Latvia Congress was preceded by a republic gathering of authorized representatives of the committees for the protection of citizens' rights and the constitutions of the USSR and the Latvian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] held a week earlier. The public civil rights formation, which was created last summer with the active participation of the communists and the Latvian SSR United Council of Labor Collectives, now has structural subdivisions in each rayon and city, at enterprises and in establishments. More than 2,200 delegates from such "primaries" represented over half a million persons.*

The press called this forum extraordinary. There was, specifically, a change in the name of the movement's coordinating body. This is now the All-Latvia Public Salvation Committee. Its chairman is A. Rubiks, first secretary of the Communist Party of Latvia Central Committee, its deputy chairman, A. Klautsen, first secretary of the Riga City Party Committee.

A. Kauls, leader of the Latvian Agriculturalists Union, is a member of the Public Salvation Committee also. In order to properly appreciate this fact, it needs to be known how authoritative A. Kauls is among Latvians as leader of the celebrated "Adazhi" agro-industrial firm, member of the country's Presidential Council, and USSR people's deputy. Incidentally, he once acknowledged an enthusiasm for the People's Front (he was elected to the presidium of the constituent congress of the Latvian People's Front), but remained, despite everything, in the ranks of the Communist Party. Essentially all public and political forces of Latvia fought "for Kauls"....

At the civil rights forum, which was held, like the party congress also, in the Social and Political Center of the Communist Party of Latvia Central Committee, I saw many comrades, familiar from the recent past, who had recently been shunning "pro-communist activities," as it were. The new circumstances of the political life of the republic have, to judge by everything, actively facilitated the final choice for these people and helped them "make up their minds." At its conference the Riga city party organization even adopted a special decision on restoring to the Communist Party of Latvia the party "rank and file" who had quit the "primaries" when relations were severed between the internationalists and the national communists and who wished to return (true, the break in the "returnees'" length of service will be noted on their record cards).

It was explained to journalists in the press centers of the Communist Party of Latvia Central Committee and the Public Salvation Committee and the information office of the United Council of Labor Collectives that none of this means that sociopolitical tension is on the wane. Rather the opposite. This was confirmed also by the appeal of the all-Latvia forum of civil rights supporters to their compatriots: "The political situation in the republic is exacerbated to the utmost. You should know the truth about where the Latvian People's Front and the Supreme Soviet are leading you. They are now openly and hastily preparing a complete severance of relations with the USSR and the establishment of a totalitarian regime. No one should be in the least doubt about this!"

An essentially similar description of the situation was given in the appeal to the USSR Supreme Soviet, which was signed on behalf of the like-minded deputies by S. Dimanis, chairman of the "Equality" faction of the republic legislature, member of the Communist Party of Latvia Central Committee and lecturer at the Latvian University. "The statement that Latvia does not intend to subscribe to the Union treaty does not reflect the opinion and wishes of considerable numbers of its historically multinational people," this appeal points out. "The 'Equality' faction has the signatures of more than 400,000 voters demanding a public referendum on the question of Latvia's official status. Only 39.2 percent of the electorate voted for the 134 deputies who adopted the 'Declaration on the Restoration of the State Independence of the Republic of Latvia.' Were this vote to be repeated now, this percentage would be far less inasmuch as the deputies of the Popular Front faction have been adopting decisions in flagrant violation of their election platform. Candidates of the Latvian People's Front suffered a crushing defeat at the supplementary elections to the local and Supreme Soviets."

The appeal of the internationalist deputies to the all-Union parliament was a kind of commentary on the "note" adopted by the votes of the Popular Front faction and sent to the USSR Supreme Soviet and president on behalf of the Latvian Supreme Soviet. This "diplomatic document," which is packed with national-separatist ambitions, employs, for example, the following turn of phrase: "In the event of avoidance of negotiations or the deliberate provocation of an exacerbation of the situation, the Republic of Latvia Supreme Soviet reserves the right to employ nonviolent methods of pressure, and the peoples of Latvia, civil disobedience in respect of the unlawful actions of the USSR authorities".

Such (truly inappropriate!) was the reaction of some Latvian members of parliament to the appeal to them from the country's Supreme Soviet, which had received with alarm news of the republic authorities' discriminatory measures in respect of Soviet servicemen.

Under these conditions, on the eve of the final session of the congress the Communist Party of Latvia Central Committee put forward the idea of creating in the republic a center-left coalition government, in which communists would participate also. The party community treated the idea with understanding. But the more constructive the approach to the increasingly complex problems among the forces of the left, the more senseless the behavior and actions of the radical right "ultras."

The recent dismantling in the city of Yekabpils of the monument to V.I. Lenin, in accordance with a decision of the local "Popular Front" soviet, may be termed nothing other than a planned provocation. Proceedings "for resisting the authorities" have been instituted in industrial Yelgava against a deputy of the city soviet who headed a picket line which was attempting to protect this same monument.... The rayon soviet of the Vidzemskoye suburb (Riga's former Proletarskiy Rayon, now renamed) urgently deprived four of its deputies, communist servicemen, of their authority as "occupiers." Members of the Communist Party of Latvia are hurriedly being removed from positions in the internal affairs authorities, and these are frequently the most experienced and most skilled employees.

The list of such outrages of an anti-communist tenor is growing. This is happening to the accompaniment of sweeping criticism of the "policy of the center and the communists," in which the entire local semi-official press has joined. It was not fortuitous that the congress of the Communist Party of Latvia particularly emphasized in its statement that the sharp exacerbation of the social and political situation in the republic is directly connected with "the usurpation by the group that has taken office" of the official mass media. While continuing to publish a number of newspapers and journals, the Communist Party and other internationalist organizations have practically no access to the "electronic press"—television and radio.

Radio Concord, created by the Latvian SSR United Council of Labor Collectives, went on the air for the first time on the day of the final session of the congress.

The congress warned the legislature and government of the republic that, in the event of their continuation of an anti-democratic policy, violations of the constitutions of the USSR and the Latvian SSR and edicts of the president of the country, and the infringement of the civil rights of people of any nationality, "the Communist Party of Latvia will call on the working people to struggle for the early termination of the authority of deputies of all levels and for new elections."

Also meeting with understanding among the delegates was the proposition concerning self-reliance, which permeated the report of A. Rubiks, first secretary of the Communist Party of Latvia Central Committee. After all, as Alfreds Petrovich colorfully put it, "the party card is not a reserved seat in the sleeping car on the journey through life but is a fighter's mandate."

Discussing the republic party organization's priority tasks, the congress "amended" the slogan "All Power to the Soviets," which has been returned to us in the years of perestroyka. The new "worker motto" of Latvia's communists—"For the Socialist Choice in the Soviets"—expresses more precisely, I believe, today's realities.

This motto really comes from reality. Many people at the congress referred to an interview which A. Kauls had granted Central Television the day before. The peasant leader spoke of the inevitable social explosion in the countryside. Leading up to this is the republic legislature's decision to return land to the former owners of the times of bourgeois Latvia and their heirs. In this way, in A. Kauls' opinion, the role of future farm laborers is being prepared for the present workers, including the tenant farmers who have only just taken their share.

Such trends are also being manifested in the city. Public opinion is being stirred by rumors to the effect that the new authorities are waiting for "the old owners from the emigre community." No one is officially refuting the concept of influential national-radical circles that full citizens (and proprietors, consequently) will only be those who were born here prior to midsummer of 1940—the date of the restoration of Soviet power—and their direct descendants, as well as those who prove their political loyalty to the authorities (communists are excluded from this "radical list" in advance).

The multinational people of Latvia watched tensely to see whether the Communist Party would retreat from its internationalist principles. The congress justified their hopes. It confirmed that the Communist Party of Latvia, as an independent political organization, is a part of the CPSU and organizes its actions in ideological and organizational unity with it.

Ivashko Chairs Meeting With Latvian Communists

LD3011203190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1733 GMT 30 Nov 90

[Text] Moscow, 30 Nov (TASS)—A meeting took place at the CPSU Central Committee today between the Secretariat of the CPSU Central Committee and the bureau of the Central Committee of the Latvian Communist Party, under the chairmanship of Vladimir Ivashko, deputy general secretary of the party Central Committee. There was a useful and comradely exchange of opinions. The activity of the republican Communist Party in the specific situation that has developed was given a positive appraisal.

Clash Over CP Premises Reflects Latvia Tensions

PM1811205790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Nov 90 Second Edition p 4

[Report by correspondent O. Meshkov: "Latvia: Situation Has Deteriorated"]

[Text] Riga—The situation in Latvia has worsened still further. The cause was the events in Yurmala on 9 November. That was when the city authorities, in the presence of the marshal of the court, tried to forcibly evict the party city committee [gorkom] from the building which had housed party and soviet workers' offices for many years.

The people's court and then the republic's State Arbitration Commission granted the city executive committee's [gorispolkom] petition. However, the USSR State Arbitration Commission deemed this ruling unlawful. But since the local authorities consider that union laws and the decisions of union authorities are not written for them, they unhesitatingly set about evicting their unwanted neighbors by force. The gorkom members initially appealed for help to the marines stationed nearby in a military sanatorium, and then special-purpose militia detachments arrived from Riga. Without standing on ceremony, members of those detachments forced the removal men to take the furniture back into the offices (incidentally, they acted equally resolutely in front of the Supreme Soviet building, where they protected the normal work and safety of legislators).

After this incident I attended a news conference arranged by the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee during which lawyers, armed with figures and documents, tried to prove to journalists that the gorispolkom has no right to use the whole building.

During a stormy sitting 5 days ago the Latvian Supreme Soviet adopted the resolution "On the impermissibility of the criminal activity of special-purpose militia detachments and the USSR Armed Forces on the Latvian Republic's territory." The document says that these criminal actions are directly organized by "the CPSU's subsidiary organization in Latvia—the Latvian Communist Party and its Central Committee, which is openly breaching the Latvian Republic's laws."

The Supreme Soviet has resolved to adopt measures to disarm the special-purpose militia detachments and end the social and material provision for all USSR Armed Forces subunits and CPSU territorial organizations on the Latvian Republic's territory until the beginning of talks between the Latvian Republic's Government and the USSR Government on the status of the USSR Armed Forces in the Latvian Republic.

The resolution was adopted by 80 votes. It was voted against not only by deputies of the "Equal Rights" group but also A. Gorbunovs, chairman of the Supreme Soviet, Deputy V. Dozortsev, one of the most active figures of the Latvian People's Front, and some other supporters of the majority faction. Some time later A. Gorbunovs declared that he could not sign the resolution that had been adopted because it affected the future of many thousands of military servicemen.

Here is what A. Klautsen, secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee, said about the document in question:

"It is patently obvious that this resolution is yet another link in the chain of measures adopted by the republic's present leadership to destabilize the situation. They are aimed against the real force which is opposing the policy of the Latvian People's Front leaders—the Army and the Communists. The question is now being put this way: Moderate leaders, such as A. Gorbunov, must leave. The republic's secession from the USSR is being pushed."

Rubiks Interviewed on Presidential Rule

LD2911045690 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian 1400 GMT 26 Nov 90

[Interview with Alfred Rubiks, CPSU Politburo member and Latvian Communist Party Central Committee first

secretary, by correspondent Alfred Leiterts on 26 November; place not given—recorded]

[Excerpts] [Leiterts] Secretary, I am disturbing you over several questions that have arisen in the past weeks and days. One of them is about presidential rule. The world's mass media for some days now are reporting that if the Baltic republics do not obey the will of the center and do not sign the Union treaty, presidential rule will be introduced. What next? This will prove how deceptive Gorbachev's often repeated claims about the sovereignty of republics, and also about democracy, have been. I would like to know whether this question has also been discussed, examined, in the Politburo, and what your personal attitude is, on this issue as a member of the Politburo? In your opinion, what good will such a step by the president bring?

[Rubiks] This question is regularly raised, not only in the Politburo but also in the USSR Supreme Soviet, whether such means are necessary, how to resort to them, how to understand presidential rule itself. This has been discussed. Regarding applying it to a specific republic, about this, so far, at least in the Politburo, there has been no talk in my presence. In the Supreme Soviet there has been such talk. It is called for by those who struggle to solve the issue of Nagorno-Karabakh; it is called for by representatives of various views from the Republic of Moldova; other voices are heard too.

One should not regard—even more so it is nothing for foreigners to get excited about—one should not regard the introduction of presidential rule in one place or another as a suppression of democracy. I think that it is really the suppression of various kinds of political organizations or groups of their political ambitions. [passage omitted]

In my opinion this does not in any way hamper sovereignty, because the president has recognized sovereignty, and I know Gorbachev's very democratic opinions on all these questions, and he is always, well, not surprised, but he is unpleasantly, let us say, well, unpleasantly gratified, like that yes [laughs], about a republic again adopting something of the kind which does not promote consolidation but only deepens the confrontation. [passage omitted]

[Leiterts] Earlier, and even quite recently, you have expressed the view that the republic's radio and television should be subordinated to the Communist Party. Are you thinking of forming alternative radio and television, or of the present ones, and if the present ones, then in what way are you thinking of achieving this, with what forces and means?

[Rubiks] Now, this is hearsay. It is hearsay; nowhere and never have I said that the Latvian Communist Party intends to subordinate the existing radio and television to itself. No way! This has been made clear not only in my speeches, but also expressed in our party's program of activity. We are in favor of recognizing various political viewpoints. We are in favor of the mass media being free from any sort of censorship and similar things. We are in favor of insisting, and it is written in the program that we will fight for a coalition type government always, because if we insist that there should be various political organizations, various viewpoints, then there must be a coalition- type government. By the way, this is the first time: No in not a single communist party in the Soviet Union, republic communist party, no one has written it into their program. It is not even written into the CPSU program. But it is in ours. Everyone can read it; it is published.

This concerns something else, this concerns what we will fight for and what we will achieve. We will have the opportunity to have our own television studio, which will broadcast what we have prepared and which would be, let us say, what our party needs, so that our ideas would be [made] known directly. The same applies to radio, so that in no sense do we have any claims on the existing radio or television.

[Leiterts] So on an alternative basis?

[Rubiks] Absolutely right.

[Leiterts] At the moment an appeal is being disseminated in the republic addressed to the citizens of Latvia, people of sound mind and goodwill. The appeal is signed by a wide range of various organizations and committees. In this appeal it says: Citizens of Latvia! we find ourselves at the end of the rope. Our patience has run out. Let us not be indifferent to our own and our children's fates. Let us unite our ranks on the road to civic unity in the name of the guaranteed future of our common homeland Latvia. You will pardon me, but these last lines sound somewhat hysterical. Is there a basis for this hysteria? Doesn't it seem here that the Army is to be made into a kind of organization to be cared for? It seems to me that the Army is a fully independent unit that must be taken into account, but it also has to look after itself.

[Rubiks] It is not hysteria and you are asking can the Army then not defend itself? I will say this: May God not let the Army start defending itself! May God not let it! [passage omitted]

[Leiterts] The Army's position was already stated in the television speech by Fedor Kuzmin, commander in chief of the Baltic Military District. It was expressed very much like an ultimatum, and listening to his speech it seemed to me personally that he is forgetting one very simple truth: Latvia is not limitless, you can not put in as many forces as you want here, and as many as necessary at the moment in connection with the withdrawal of troops from East Europe. It seems to me that it is not acceptable to talk to the people this way.

[Rubiks] To all this, in my opinion, one should not forget that it is not the commander in chief, of any military district, who chooses the place to put this or that Army unit. All this is decided at a government level. Those territories which currently are at the disposal of the troops, these were allotted at one time by a decision of

our own Latvian SSR Government, coordinated with a decision by the USSR Government. In these territories they are entitled to act as required by the president, and the withdrawal of the troops from East Europe is taking place under the control of the USSR Government. So Kuzmin should not be blamed for what he decides here. He decides this in the name of the government.

[Leiterts] Thank you, no more questions.

[Rubiks] Thanks to you too. I am grateful to be able to speak on the radio. thank you.

CPSU Role in Latvian Republic Viewed

91UN0384A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 27 Nov 90 p 2

[Report by V. Proskura: "A Distant and Long Road...."]

[Text] Riga— **Soon, on 1 December, delegates to the 25th Latvian Communist Party Congress will be assembling for its final session, which will be a continuation of the longest congress in the entire 90-year history of the Latvian Communist Party. It began its work back in early April. During this eight-month recess, called to work out decisions, many events have occurred.**

First, there is the organized withdrawal from the Republic Communist Party of its "fifth column"—primarily apparatchiks from various departments and levels. The term "fifth column" is used here, incidentally, not only in its well-known historical sense, but also to signify the number of those leaving—about one-fifth.

The fate of those who "deliberately broke off" is dramatic in and of itself. They hastily formed an "independent Latvian Communist Party" and then proclaimed themselves the democratic party of the workers with a social democratic orientation, but while "on the move" they fired on most of their associates and—the main thing—failed to find a social base among the working class. They discarded their allies in the People's Front. At the last congress of the Latvian People's Front, the representative of the "democratic workers" was forced to complain that for some reason his party was feeling national socialist pressure from former companions-in-arms.

Its loss of the role of ruling party and the ascension to power in the Republic of a People's Front bloc, including ultranationalist movements, was another major trial for the Latvian Communist Party. Its palpable defeat in the elections to the Supreme Soviet and in the elections to the local soviets was the more vexing because they had been foreordained by the ideological and organizational disorder in the Communist Party itself and the double-dealing policy of a number of the "turncoats" among the leaders.

The Latvian Communist Party leadership, renewed during the first stage of the congress, set a course toward "constructive opposition." The United Council of Labor Collectives [OSTK] of the Latvian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic], the International Workers' Front, the Democratic Initiative Center (a grouping of the scientific intelligentsia from the capital), and other progressive organizations were affiliated with the Communist Party. Against this background,the recent Riga City party conference acquired special significance. And not only because half of today's 120,000- strong detachment of Latvian Communists are from Riga. The capital's party organization, as befits it, thus became the cementing nucleus around which the healthy forces of the Latvian Communist Party rallied. First Secretary of the Riga gorkom [city party committee] A. Klautsen was also elected a Central Committee secretary. The recognized leader of the Latvian Communist Party became the recent chairman of the capital's gorispolkom [city soviet executive committee], A. Rubiks, later headed the Latvian SSR OSTK executive committee, where the city's labor collectives also set the tone. The first secretaries of the rayon Latvian Communist Party committees [raykoms] at all four of the factory areas in Riga were elected, as was A. Rubiks, deputies of the republic legislature. They also have a major say in the Supreme Soviet, where they are part of the "Ravnopraviye" internationalist faction, which unites not only Communists. Gorkom and raykom secretaries were also elected to the "headquarters" of a new public movement—the Committee To Safeguard the Rights of Citizens, the USSR Constitution, and the Latvian SSR Constitution.

The Riga party conference took place at the same moment that it seemed social and political tension in the republic had reached a critical point. Some of the hotheads at the meetings and in the mass media are unambiguously calling that moment the eve of a social explosion and the threshold of a "clash at the barricades." The prerequisites for such vehement oracles are well known.

Having passed by a two-thirds majority the "Declaration of Independence" and rejecting the presidential ukase that followed, stating that the enactment was unlawful, the republic's legislature formed monopolies in the political sense in the Supreme Soviet Presidium, the Council of Ministers, and other government organs, and appointed a general procurator.... A voluntary people's militia was set up with "party acknowledgement." While relying on the growing support of the Republic's leadership, the authorities in the capital (even though the People's Front people have a majority of only one in the Riga city soviet) are also concerned first and foremost about the political offensive "against communism." In their speeches and documents the leaders of the Latvian People's Front are calling for the memory of Soviet Latvia, the socialist choice, and real internationalism to be "bulldozed to destruction."

The latest decisions of the republic's legislature to "shut off the faucets"—deprive units of the Soviet Army located on Latvian territory of social and material support—have poured more oil on the fire. To put it simply, as winter starts they want to deprive servicemen and their families of basic municipal services—heat, electric

lighting.... A similar fate has been promised for the "territorial branch of the CPSU"—the Communist Party committees. In short, an unprecedented domestic political and economic blockade has been announced, within which it is simply impossible to live. One way or another it must be broken.

Earlier representatives of the authorities announced their intention of making liable those who out of their own convictions and in accordance with the decision of their own labor collective celebrated the anniversary of the Great October, and thus failed to turn up for work on that holiday. If we take into account the fact that an unprecedented number of people—more than 120,000—attended the demonstration in Riga, then those kinds of threats have "hit home" and incensed broad strata of the workers, and by no means always has anything to do with their national affiliation.

Plant workers have been put on their guard by the refusal of the ministerial cabinet to accept the "Progress" intersector joint-stock company, which includes major enterprises in Riga, set up by the labor collectives. Incidentally, a professor in the capital's university, O. Potreki, a well-known economist and Latvian Communist Party Central Committee secretary for social issues, has been elected chairman of the council of founder members to manage the state portion of the property in the new-born republic joint-stock company. The authorities have started a regular war against the will of the labor collectives....

A whole mess of both mutual links and autonomous problems of a quite unexpected nature was found during the process of the city party conference, and exhaustive answers were not found for all questions. This is understandable, for the Latvian Communist Party has virtually never had to work under conditions of a legal opposition; in bourgeois Latvia the party was banned and operated underground. Even the heroic experience of its veterans is not always applicable in this very complex situation. However, even today there are still threats to place even the "territorial organization of the CPSU" outside the law. An opinion on this subject, unanimously supported by delegates was voiced at the conference: In the event of "political aggression" or attempts to "deepen the anticonstitutional coup," bring out the workers in a general strike. Its motto has also been coined: "Do not play with fire, gentlemen!"

There is no doubt that much will be clarified after the adoption of summary documents by the republic party congress, in particular, during the final work on the Latvian Communist Party Program and Rules. Two fundamental viewpoints also exist among the Communists of Riga: preserve the organizational link with the CPSU or, giving due consideration to the realities, form an ideological-political bloc with it and strengthen the bonds of ideological unity and international brotherhood.

There is more. The conference delegates supported a proposal from the labor collectives of Moskovskiy and Oktyabrskiy rayons in Riga to convene a congress of leftist forces in Latvia and thus create a single bloc of progressive organizations with the active involvement of Communists, so that they can move in new elections, possibly early elections, if the sociopolitical situation so demands.... As the gorkom first secretary, A. Klautsen, and the CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and Latvian Communist Party Central Committee first secretary, A. Rubiks, emphasized in their speeches, this idea must be thoroughly considered during the concluding meeting of the 25th Latvian Communist Party Congress.

* * *

When I was writing these lines I learned that the conference delegates had voted (unanimously!) for ideological-organizational unity for the Latvian Communist Party and the CPSU with independence for the Republic's Communists in resolving their own regional issues.

Legal Battle Over Enterprises Continues

LD1712171690 Moscow TASS in English 1441 GMT 17 Dec 90

[By TASS correspondent Valeriy Zaytsev]

[Text] Riga December 17 TASS—The battle of the laws between the Soviet Government and the Latvian parliament continues with the republican parliament adopting a law on state enterprises, repealing a similar Soviet law.

The republican parliament extended the application of the law to "all state enterprises on Latvian territory, including those subordinated to soviet departments." Before the law was adopted, the Soviet Government had reformed all enterprises subordinated to the Union into joint-stock companies. Fifty-one percent of their shares are owned by work collectives. The republican parliament has repealed the Soviet Government's resolution.

Deputy Leonid Kurdyumov believes the Latvian law returns all state enterprises to the "Stalin-Brezhnev period," as it gives limited rights to work collectives.

Opposition equal rights faction leader Sergey Dimanis believes the new law is aimed to make state industry in Latvia a "single factory headed by the prime minister."

Law on 'Permanent Resident' Status Considered

PM1312115590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Dec 90 Union Edition p 2

[Report by correspondent Irina Litvinova under "Direct Line" rubric: "Concerning 'Permanent Residents'"]

[Text] Riga—The Latvian legislature is continuing to adopt laws without answering the question that is worrying the populace: Who are those "citizens" who will be able to enjoy the various rights of the new legislation?

The "Equality" [Ravnopraviye] faction deputies say that this is one of the chief questions the voters put to them at meetings. Moreover, in the last few days the vagueness of the status of "permanent resident" has added to the questionable concepts of citizenship. An interview in the paper RIGAS BALSS with Maris Plyavniyeks, head of the People's Front immigration commission, added fuel to the flames of political instability. In his view, Latvia must be an ethnic state: In order that it might be built "in a democratic way," a law on permanent residents is being drafted. They will not be able to participate in elections and they are not entitled to own land. Regular servicemen, KGB staffers, retired officers, and "those who are members of organizations hostile to the Latvian Republic, who are calling for the violent overthrow of the state system, who have been involved in crimes against humanity and genocide against the Latvian people" will not be able to obtain "permanent resident" status.

Salvation Committee on Human Rights 'Violations'

LD1512054690 Moscow TASS in English 2141 GMT 14 Dec 90

[By TASS special correspondents Aleksandr Antsiferov and Yuriy Sizov]

[Text] Riga December 14 TASS—Some 4,000 complaints and applications about human rights violations have been received by the Latvian Salvation Committee this year. They describe violations of not only Soviet constitutional fundamentals but also international norms.

Commenting on these complaints, presidium member of the Latvian Committee Alexey Litvinenko said that the Latvian People's Front (LPF) and its group in the republican parliament "are openly and hurriedly preparing to break off completely with the Soviet Union and to establish a totalitarian semi-Nazi regime".

Laws adopted recently by the republican parliament where the majority is controlled by the LPF, prompt the following conclusion: the slogan "the rights of a nation are above human rights" dominates the Latvian state policy.

Litvinenko described the recently adopted laws and decisions to form law and order detachments, establish land borders with the Russian Federation, Byelorussia, Lithuania, and Estonia and to repeal state holidays of the USSR in Latvia as a violation of the USSR and Latvian constitutions.

In addition, he continued, Latvia refused to grant privileges to invalids and participants in the Great Patriotic War, 1941-1945, provided for by Soviet legislation. The republic deprived this category of people of preferential medical aid.

Rejecting a plan for new housing construction to meet the needs of people on the waiting list, the republican government hopes to resolve this problem due to the outflow of Russian-speaking population from the republic.

In Litvinenko's opinion, there is growing discrimination against people and social groups, especially servicemen and their families. They do not receive food coupons, medical establishments refuse to give them medical aid, and they are not hired at factories and offices.

Their children are barred from creches, kindergarten and schools.

Litvinenko stressed that it is necessary to repeal laws and decisions adopted by the Latvian parliament and Government, which run counter to the Soviet Constitution, and to call to account those who are guilty of fanning up ethnic strife and of violating the Soviet president's decrees.

Latvian Mockery of State Symbols Assailed

91UN0489A Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 13 Dec 90 First Edition p 1

[Open letter to USSR President M.S. Gorbachev by A.I. Slishans on behalf of a group of Latvian party veterans: "Do Not Destroy Homes; Several Questions to USSR President M.S. Gorbachev"]

[Text] Esteemed Mikhail Sergeyevich!

We appeal to you with pain and alarm.

Quite recently, you fought to expand presidential powers, and you were granted such powers.... Why do you allow scandalous lawlessness, disturbances, and bloodshed to occur now? This was unheard of in the USSR before 1985.

The process of disintegration of the Union is picking up speed with every passing day. We, the veterans, both Latvians and Russians, as well as all the inhabitants of Latvia who have not succumbed to nationalist intoxication, are concerned the most about ways to preserve the Union as a unified state. We do not want it to disintegrate into different principalities.

In your decree dated 14 May 1990, you proclaimed the Declaration of Independence of Latvia to be a void unconstitutional act. Why have you been unable to ensure compliance with the decree?

In all other countries of the world that have federative structures, federal (Union) laws are superior to the laws of states, lands, and so on. How come everything works out the other way around in our country? Why does a handful of deputies of local (republic) soviets repeal and nullify Union laws? Will you be able to change something in this respect? Or will this legislative chaos continue?

V.I. Lenin, the creator and founder of the USSR, is respected throughout the world. However, our republic has been swept by a shameful wave of dismantling monuments to V.I. Lenin. On the eve of the 73d anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, mockery and vandalism assumed even more barbaric forms. They merely laugh at your decree on this account: They say that the decrees of neighboring states do not apply to us. The neonationalist gentlemen have got it their way only because the central and executive authorities are weak. Latvia still has not legally seceded from the Soviet Union. Why do you let these gentleman carry on disgracefully and desecrate our memories and feelings?

Nothing is sacred in the Republic of Latvia anymore. Victory Day is not going to be a holiday from 1991 on either. For those ruling our republic, the 1,418 fiery days and nights that the Soviet people survived mean nothing, as well as the memory of 27 million of those who died in the name of freedom and independence of our motherland. Tell me, could you not offer some treatment for these callous hearts? Let us remind our "brownshirts" that the Soviet Union still exists! One cannot remain neutral on issues of this nature.

The "brownshirts" are becoming more and more arrogant while we are being silent.

In our republic, the symbols of the Union state—the anthem, flag, and emblem—have been subjected to mockery after the 4 May 1990, declaration. All who so desire trample on them and burn them. Meanwhile, our "democrats," these "two-faced Januses," are crying from the rooftops and proclaiming the creation of a state of law!

It pains and distresses us to see the Soviet Army here, in Latvia, turned into a hostile force, entangled in lies, slandered, and to see mud slung at it. At the same time, the Aizsarg [defender] detachments are being restored, and unions of former Hitlerite warriors from SS divisions are being set up. Why do the president and his council fail to see or notice these subversive activities? For what purpose are these acts of subversion allowed to occur? Who profits by this?

The Government of the Republic of Latvia has introduced customs inspections along our borders with the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] and Belorussia: gates and checkpoints with all the state symbols. We believe that this is a step toward the secession of Latvia from the USSR.

I am Latvian; I fervently love my land and my people. I experience boundless pain and shame on account of the fact that since 4 May 1990, the entire population of a nonindigenous nationality in Latvia has turned into occupiers, migrants, and undesirable elements. Insults, jeers, and violations of human dignity have become commonplace.

The Government of the Republic of Latvia refused to ratify the USSR Law on Retirement Benefits for USSR Citizens. Many articles of this law on preferences for disabled veterans and participants in the Great Patriotic War already took effect on 1 October 1990. In our republic, these people are deprived of the preferences. If we call a spade a spade, this amounts to intentional discrimination of war veterans. Meanwhile, the powers that be are saying: "Your president does not give orders here!" How much longer will the humiliation of war veterans continue?

The draft new Union law has already been submitted for discussion. However, the Baltic republics have refused to take part in developing and signing the treaty. We have been offered a new model of the country, "a Union of Sovereign States." A folk maxim says: "Do not destroy an old house before you build a new one." Why has this rule been neglected in our country? Who has spurred us on to let the "old" USSR as a unified state fall apart before even a theoretical outline of a new one has been marked?

In the sixth year of perestroyka, the people of our great country have been reduced to the position of beggars. It is a great shame that they put together packages with canned food for us in neighboring countries. It has come to us being treated as beggars!

We are on the brink of an abyss beyond which lie long years of woes and tears. Who will save the country?

Such is the bitter truth about the dire situation in our republic and the country as a whole.

Our letters are not printed in the local newspapers and magazines. This is why we, a group of party veterans, resolved to state our thoughts in the form of questions to the president of the country, despite being uncertain as to whether they will reach the addressee...

[Signed] On behalf of a group of party veterans from Latvia, A.I. Slishans, Riga

Procuracy Denounces People's Front 'Challenge'

LD1512094190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0742 GMT 15 Dec

[By TASS special correspondents Aleksandr Antsiferov and Yuriy Sizov]

[Text] Riga, 15 Dec (TASS)—The statement by the Latvian People's Front [LPF] on the eve of the Fourth Congress of USSR People's Deputies, which contains calls for civil disobedience and the undermining of state security, has yet further worsened the political situation in this Baltic republic.

With respect to this, the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Procuracy has today published here a statement stressing that "the recomendations thrust on the Latvian population by the LPF are illegal, extremist, and amoral. There are good reasons to view them as an

open challenge to all the people of the Soviet Union, the USSR president, and the world community. The LPF leadership is prepared to cause Latvia to fall into a situation of economic chaos and collapse, and into the danger of social conflicts and even bloodletting."

The statement notes that the recomendations of the LPF governing body openly provoke the Latvian population to commit particularly dangerous state crimes.

The Latvian SSR Procuracy warns the head of ministries and departments and all officials and inhabitants of the Republic that "if they implement the recommendations of the governing body of the LPF, thereby undermining state security and the country's economy, inflaming interethnic differences and provoking social conflicts, they will be called to account in accordance with existing criminal law."

People's Front Campaigns Against Union Treaty

PM0512152390 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 4 Dec 90 First Edition p 1

[Report by KRASNAYA ZVEZDA correspondent under the "Direct Line" rubric: "Latvian People's Front Action"]

[Text] Whereas the All-Latvian Public Salvation Committee (as the Committee for the Protection of Citizens' Rights and the Constitutions of the USSR and the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic is now known) has unambiguously supported the preparation and signing of a new Union treaty, the Latvian People's Front [LPF] has reacted negatively and is acting accordingly. It has launched a large-scale campaign to collect signatures against the conclusion of the Union Treaty "in any form with a state which does not recognize the right of nations to self-determination and which uses force to preserve the Union. That is what it says in the LPF Board's appeal to the Latvian people. All LPF coordinating centers and groups in enterprises have been sent special forms which they are asked to sign to express their support for the LPF's stance toward the treaty and thus oppose those want to stop the consistent movement toward an independent Latvian state and suppress the will of the majority of the Latvian people by slander." [quotation marks as published]

The deadline for the collection of signatures is 11 December, and it has been decided to try to collect at least 500,000. "We do not intend to collect the signatures of all the people living in Latvia," the appeal said. "We are not conducting a referendum. By our action we are going to demonstrate the strength of the LPF's organizations and support."

The LPF categorically excludes and rejects a referendum on a question of such importance for the Latvian people as the Union treaty. There are many facts which suggest that specific countermeasures are being prepared "if a referendum is imposed."

Latvian Front Urges Deputy's Resignation

91UN0469A Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 11 Dec 90 p 2

[Article by SELSKAYA ZHIZN correspondent A. Timkov: "The LPF Against Kauls"]

[Text] Riga, 10 December—The LPF [Latvian People's Front] Dome urged the voters to recall USSR People's Deputy Albert Kauls. It was not announced what prompted this decision, but anyone who follows the course of events in the Republic will understand it.

Albert Ernestovich Kauls, member of the Presidential Council of our country, vigorously opposes immediate secession from the USSR and denounces the adoption of laws and decrees that aggravate political and economic instability in the Republic. Militant radicals count him among the traitors to the Latvian people and the enemies of national renaissance because of a principled position taken by the chairman of the Adazhi agricultural company. Previously, however, they did not come out against a deputy mandate for him. They were probably prompted to go over to the overt offensive by the fact that A. Kauls had agreed to become a cochairman of the All-Latvian Committee of Public Salvation. The latter sets the goal of preserving the integrity of a renewed union, preventing the discrimination of people in Latvia on the basis of their political convictions and ethnic affiliation, and preventing conflicts from flaring up.

Latvian Deputy Criticizes Popular Front Tendencies

LD2911231790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 29 Nov 90

[Report by N. Kasyanova from Riga on session of Latvian Supreme Soviet, including interview with V. Dozortsev, Latvian Supreme Soviet deputy from the Popular Front of Latvia; from the "Vremya" newscast—recorded]

[Text] [Kasyanova] In Latvia it is warm even in the final days of November, but there is a noticeably cold draught blowing through the republic's legislature. Even though the Christmas recess is drawing near, the deputies have accelerated the pace at which decisions and laws are being adopted. Incidentally, having amended the republic's Constitution and having left the possibility of endorsing any decision by one-third of the total membership of the Supreme Soviet, when, in fact, 67 people can decide the fate of the people, the fate of the republic, the problem is simplified.

[Kasyanova] What prompted you, a person who was in at the creation of the Popular Front, to rise against your own group, against the Popular Front group in the Supreme Soviet?

[Dozortsev] Well, you see, I rose up, nevertheless, not against the group, but against certain tendencies within the group, against our internal democracy as it were,

during the creation of which we took several I would say unbalanced decisions. In order that that should not happen in the future, it seems to me that within the group there must be a different atmosphere, a discussion atmosphere, so that if there is any dissent within the group it must have some outlet.

Above all, I didn't like the new quorum that, let's say, through the energy of the group was adopted at the session of the Latvian Republic's Supreme Soviet; that low quorum that does not as it were guarantee well-balanced laws, and, in general, deprives some of the deputies of some inner energy to fight for their own opinions.

Second, it seems to me that we have not properly thought through the decision that affected the Army. It seems to me that it is not a timely decision, and I think that it is dangerous to the republic. Maybe we will still somehow be able to return to a discussion of the matter, and I hope that now, after two or three perhaps very serious conversations have taken place within the group about internal democracy—the democratic nature let's say of the voting system in the group—perhaps we shall find some better considered way out of that decision.

[Kasyanova] After extending the plenary sitting, the parliament approved the second reading of the draft laws on the taxation of profits and on social taxation, and, after intense arguments over who should be regarded as war veterans, the third reading of the draft law on state pensions.

The day after tomorrow, the deputies will gather in Vilnius for an extraordinary joint sitting with the Supreme Soviet of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

Latvia Said 'Not Capable' of Guarding Border

PM2211172190 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 21 Nov 90 First Edition p 4

[Interview with Lieutenant General V.I. Gaponenko, chief of the USSR KGB Baltic Border District, by TASS correspondent V. Zaytsev: "Who Is To Guard the State Border"—date and place not given]

[Text] The Latvian Supreme Soviet has approved the draft law on the state border at its first reading. TASS correspondent V. Zaytsev asked Lieutenant General V.I. Gaponenko, chief of the USSR Baltic Border District, to comment on this decision made by the republic's people's deputies:

[Gaponenko] The legislatures of all three republics, trying to implement their declarations on the restoration of state independence, are creating parallel structures, including border service structures. Lithuania and Estonia have embarked on the path of creating economic borders designed to protect the internal market. Customs posts have been set up on the borders with other union republics. Latvia is resolving the question not of administrative-territorial borders but of the state border. It is planned to restore it—the land, sea, and air border—in its entirety as it was 16 June 1940, and at the same time to create a border guards service.

[Zaytsev] If the emergence of parallel structures is legalized, how might events develop then?

[Gaponenko] It is quite obvious that the Baltic District border troops will continue to fulfill the tasks they are given. Experience shows that the existence of two parallel structures (and these are armed people subordinate to different organs of administration) can easily lead to undesirable consequences. Furthermore, such a situation will bring confusion into the procedure of crossing the border into adjacent states. Incidentally, they have already come up against this in Lithuania at the "Lazdijai" checkpoint. A Lithuanian border guard post was set up 500 meters from our post. The procedure for examining and checking documents there meant that existing norms were being violated. This caused justifiable complaints from foreign citizens. In the end the Lithuanian authorities were forced to suspend its work.

But the main thing is that under the USSR Constitution questions of guarding the state border come under the Soviet Union's authority. Latvia is at present part of the USSR, whether legislators want to admit that or not.

[Zaytsev] What will the reaction of its neighbors be in connection with the adoption of this draft law?

[Gaponenko] I think it will be extremely negative. The questions were not agreed either with the Supreme Soviets of Belorussia or the Russian Federation, or with neighboring countries—Finland and Sweden—although in international practice it is normal to resolve these questions jointly.

Latvia will evidently also be putting forward territorial claims. This primarily concerns Pytalovskiy Rayon, which belonged to Latvia in 1940 but was transferred to the RSFSR in accordance with legislative acts on the grounds of a number of objective circumstances.

[Zaytsev] Nevertheless, from a professional viewpoint how do you assess the possibility of the practical implementation of this law?

[Gaponenko] To put it bluntly, the Baltic Border District is responsible for the protection of the USSR State Border, and without the permission of the USSR president we cannot transfer the functions of guarding the border to the republic's authority. Furthermore, Latvia is not at present really capable of taking on itself the responsibility of guarding the border. Take, for example, the air border. The country's air defense troops are carrying out these tasks, for instance. Can they defend their positions? After all, this is a question of the security of the Soviet Union.

There are no professional cadres in Latvia either, and at least 1,000 people are needed to do the job. And what is to be done about the creation of the 21 border posts provided for in the draft law on the Latvian state border?

Our specialists estimate the expenditure involved in setting up and equipping the posts at around 25 million rubles. Is such expenditure necessary?

The Latvian legislature stresses that a sovereign state needs this law. But in this situation the question of the unity and protection of the borders also greatly affects the sovereignty of the USSR.

Latvian Citizens' Committee Changes Name

91UN0411A Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian No 48, 1 Dec 90 p 2

[Article by E. Govorushko under the rubric "The Passions Around the Power": "Committee for Salvation"]

[Text] Riga— **Together with A. Rubiks, member of the Politburo and first secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee, A. Kauls, member of the Presidential Council and chairman of the republic's agricultural council, has unexpectedly become a co chairman of the All-Latvian Committee for Public Salvation. This decision was made a couple of days ago by the council of the Committee To Defend the Rights of Citizens, the USSR Constitution, and the Latvian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic]. At a proposal of the presidium of that committee, the congress also reorganized it into the All-Latvian Committee for Public Salvation.**

This event is perceived here as the appearance in the political spectrum of a new force directed against the Republic's slide toward separatism and the official leadership's refusal to discuss and sign the Union treaty.

The Second All-Latvian Congress of Committees of Public Salvation, attended by about 2,200 delegates, adopted an Appeal to Our Fellow Countrymen. It discusses "...the establishment of a totalitarian, profascist regime" in the Republic. And in particular it says, "In the crisis existing in the Republic and the country, the congress considers it necessary to adopt effective measures to overcome economic dislocation, achieve civil harmony, and maintain the foundations of state unity with the USSR." Resolutions were also adopted in support of the program that President of the USSR M. Gorbachev announced 17 November at the USSR Supreme Soviet session and in support of Latvia's signing of the Union treaty.

As is known, the Republic's legislature recently adopted a decree directed at discrimination against servicemen and members of their families. There are also many residents of the Republic who have reacted negatively to the unprecedented note of the Latvian Supreme Soviet to the legislature and Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet threatening civil disobedience against the allegedly "illegal actions of the USSR authorities"....

Agricultural Workers Union Congress Opens

LD0712131290 Moscow TASS in English 1257 GMT 7 Dec 90

[By TASS correspondent Galina Kuchina]

[Text] Riga December 7 TASS—The Latvian saying that "wherever there are two Latvians, there must be at least three parties" was often heard in Riga on the eve of the congress of the Union of Latvia Agricultural Workers, which opened here today. Its 900 delegates are to decide whether this powerful economic organisation will be turned into a political party or not.

The delegates of the congress represent 227,000 farm workers, both individual farmers and those that work on collective farms. One in five belongs to some political movement or party.

The Union of Latvian Agricultural Workers was set up one and a half years ago to campaign for reforms in the countryside, making farmers real masters on their land and giving them the right to benefit by the results of their labour.

The union has set up several producers' associations, thereby eliminating the administrative system's unnecessary links, engaged in distributing the results of other people's work.

Political ambitions were aroused by the union's modest success at last year's elections. Many urban politicians campaigned in the countryside under the slogan: "Those who are against the popular front, are against the people".

This meant that very few real agricultural experts were elected to the Latvian parliament, which was always known for its strong agrarian fraction. This is when the idea of forming a separate party originated. There were people who objected, saying they were fed up with party interference in economic affairs.

The land reform law disappointed many farmers. "It is intended to undermine large-scale husbandries. It is a real time bomb, planted by incompetent politicians," vice chairman of the union Aivarsb Bertulis told TASS. The law is likewise assessed by the union's Chairman Albert Kauls, who said that "it has the purpose of completely ruining agriculture".

Kauls' tough stand irritates some people in the republic. They resent his statement: "We must not allow a handful of Riga extremists to lead us into a mire, out of which Latvia will not be able to extricate itself until the end of the century". And although the union favours Latvia's independence, it stresses that independence is possible only if there is a strong economy. Some people are trying to present Kauls as an opponent of the republic's yearning for complete independence.

Kauls intends to resign and calls for Latvian ex-premier Vilnis Bresis to be elected in his place.

Fascist 'Secret Service' Exposed in Latvia

PM2911122190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
28 Nov 90 Second Edition p 6

[Article by V. Chertkov: "SD: Heil Legzdins! Underground Secret Service Revealed in Latvia"]

[Text] "Structurally the SD [Slepenais Dienests, Security Service] had to be a top-secret organization covering many rayons of Latvia. It was planned to head the SD with a council of people best informed about the organization's activity. Then 'five-man cells' were set up in rayons and cities. One of the council members would know the cell leaders personally, and the council would possess full information about the rest.

"For the transfer of materials it was proposed to use 'mailboxes'—hiding places—involving a special code developed by J. Legzdins.

"In addition to Riga, J. Legzdins took specific steps to create underground SD structures in the cities of Rezekne, Bauska, Valmiera, Liepaja...

"From testimonies by leaders of the SD."

"Was the SD really conceived—and it appears from its aims that it was—as an organization akin to Hitler's political intelligence, which was headed by Schellenberg?"

"The ambitions were great. If the SD's activities had not been stopped in time, who knows how it would all have turned out... But you have remarked correctly on the thrust of the organization. A secret service is a secret service, and the news of it in Latvia made many people ask: 'Are the skies over the republic cloudless...?'"

...I was talking with employees of law-enforcement organs who have conducted an investigation into the SD's activities ("It would be terrible if any of its roots were left anywhere") and thinking of the forgotten lessons of History (Stirlitz comes to mind). Had that harmful tree not been shaken, there would have been a disaster, which was indeed already creeping up to our doorstep. A moment later it would have been in the house, and it would have been too late to shout "Fire." Society knows who has material assets and money now, and organized criminal groups are making deals with anyone they like, if only to maintain the unstable situation in the country.

An organization which not only acquires but also stockpiles weapons is a force which tomorrow will find secret apartments and chance gateways too cramped. Again—heil; once again stand at attention, following the orders of such people as Legzdins? We should know from which bank the crap rushes toward the rapids because, let us acknowledge, the danger of a totalitarian regime, of whatever stripe, does exist.

There were many of these people who looked back in their mind to that SD which once held all Germany and all Europe in fear. Meanwhile they were arming themselves. "At the congress of the 'Latvian Rebirth Party' in the spring of 1990 Ilmar Rudzis, member of the SD's Rezekne group, made the acquaintance of Igor Shishkin, delegate from the city of Bauska. According to the latter, 'his people' were closely linked with Legzdins' organization. I. Shishkin declared that his group had an adequate quantity of firearms needed 'for the struggle to liberate Latvia.' However, he still intended to acquire weapons. I. Rudzis subsequently gave him assistance in buying a German-made submachine gun from his acquaintance Janis Bondars.

"The question of acquiring weapons was constantly at the center of Legzdins' attention. In the fall of 1988 he and J. Mucenieks intended to acquire Israeli-made UZI submachine guns through J. Kljavins in Tallinn.

"At the beginning of February 1989 Legzdins and J. Kante drew up a plan to break into a military installation in Lilaste and grab weapons held there. In the spring of the same year Legzdins, Kante, and M. Ekard investigated the question of stealing topographic charts and weapons from Riga's Suvorov School."

More and more names emerge from the case. Companions in arms... It is a pity the noise from the tramping columns was not heard by many of those who possess real power in Latvia today...

In conversation with R. Klimovich in the second half of June 1988 Legzdins' confederate Mucenieks advanced the idea of creating an underground organization with a view to using it for an armed struggle in the event of a crisis developing in the republic. It was not long before an organizational meeting with a wide circle of people was held.

Not wishing to remain in a secondary role, at the beginning of August 1988 Legzdins set up his "own" security service. He says:

"In discussing the possible functions of the new service, we decided that they could be to provide information on people who had voluntarily expressed agreement to work in the EPC (Environment Protection Club—V.Ch.) or the MLNI (Movement for Latvia's National Independence—V.Ch.) but who had begun to have doubts about some circumstances; information on KGB, militia, and soviet executive committee workers and CPSU members; data on production enterprises and the location of military units."

The aforementioned Kante paints the picture somewhat more broadly:

"According to Legzdins, his organization's activity was aimed at the violent seizure of power in Latvia, even including the artificial creation of a crisis situation."

Who are they? Yesterday's "forest brothers" who have stuck to their positions, who passed through the camps, embittered and suffering from nostalgia for past times? No. A new generation. People of new professions and, as

we thought, new thinking... They travel with us on the streetcar and stand in lines. If they find themselves abroad, they also try to establish ties with special services. To hand over intelligence data in exchange for materials and technical facilities to expand their activities.

Take this Janis Legzdins, for example. He was born in 1969 and studied in school and then at Riga's No 2 Medical School, from which he was expelled for poor progress and cutting classes. He worked as a technician for the Riga City Telephone Network. Then he decided to engage in "political struggle," only not under the lights in legislative halls but on the garbage heaps of history, to which he made his way through special manholes in the fences. He sought out appropriate friends for himself—such as Gunar Rode, former Soviet citizen but now a Swedish subject and an adviser on military matters to the emigre organization "Daugavas Vanagi." Was Rode not the person who passed on his long-standing schemes to Legzdins—to create concentration camps for Russians and Jews, so that they would not hamper the construction of the "democratic home" on Lettish soil? Both men were planning a military coup. The SD leader evidently intended to ask Rode how best to carry it out. He kept Rode's address in his notebook. To wage armed struggle it was planned to use subdivisions of the organizations created earlier (by J. Mucenieks, L. Hirssons, and others) or to conclude a military alliance with them.

Legzdins conceived of a plan code-named "Lidojums" (and consulted with Mucenieks, considering him the "master" in such matters)—to seize the archives of the Tsesisskiy Rayon KGB and take them abroad in an agricultural aircraft specially commandeered for the purpose.

The SD's activities were wide-ranging. It should not be thought that dim-witted boys were involved. If you were to fall among such people in hard times, they would disembowel you without a moment's thought. Sinister shadows could be seen behind their backs... Hitler also started early, and he was called an operetta fuehrer, but at thirty he was already organizing the fascist National Socialist Party of Germany, and we know what happened after that.

Being leader of the MLNI's Rezekne branch, Aivar Proveis received an assignment from Legzdins to create an SD agent network in his city, and at one meeting he called for information to be gathered on the military units stationed in the rayon (numerical strength, function, armament) and on KGB and Internal Affairs Ministry subunits (strength, staffers' places of residence, family composition). A map of Latvia with military installations drawn in and other information of a military nature were confiscated during searches of SD members' places of residence.

"In November 1989 Legzdins traveled to a military installation near Ventspils, contacted Raivo Kokins, recruited him, and received extensive information on that military unit. Kokins directed him toward 'reliable guys' serving there: Grasmanis, Krumins, Kalves."

"Legzdins had his own man at the telephone exchange to listen to conversations."

"In October 1988 Legzdins and Klimovich gave information on the SD's activity to Juris Kaza, an 'independent' journalist living in Sweden, who at that time was in Riga for the First Latvian People's Front Congress. Kaza promised to obtain canisters of tear gas, high-sensitivity film and attachments for taking photographs in the dark, photoreduction equipment, descriptions of cryptographic writing and enciphering methods, aids relating to secrecy and the activities of special services, instructions for the manufacture and use of explosives..."

When Legzdins was arrested, absurd claims were heard, each one more terrible than the last, that a pistol had been planted on him, that the young man was being tortured in the cells, that he was not allowed to see an attorney, that his arms had been broken, and that his mother could not recognize her son's signature on the receipt for a package.

The newspaper SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA wrote 31 October 1990: "Latvian Republic People's Deputy Emerita Bukele insisted on a meeting with Legzdins, and the first question that she put to the investigator was this: Is he not being beaten very badly during interrogations? Then she saw before her Legzdins himself—alive and well. She could even speak with him. She learned to her amazement that he was not being beaten at all but, on the contrary, was being treated with exceptional correctness and addressed only as 'vy' [formal word for "you"]. He was well fed. And his cell was dry. And there was a library. And his linen was being changed. And he was given newspapers to read every day. And he was refusing an attorney on his own initiative."

While working in the EPC Information Department, Legzdins used his position to cover up the SD's activity and drew "greens" into his dirty business, from which all honest people smelled such a brown stench...

Explosions Destroy Latvian 'Fascist' Monuments

91UN0469B Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian No 50, 12 Dec 90 p 3

[Article by LITERATURNAYA GAZETA Latvian correspondent Tatyana Fast: "The Monument War"]

[Text] Recently, Latvia was rocked by four explosions at night. Monuments were blown up. No, this time these were not monuments to Lenin. The latter were not blown up, but rather torn down with the help of bulldozers or truck cranes depending on the equipment of the local soviets, which in this manner settled their scores with the past.

The recent operation was instantaneous and technically well-prepared. This time, a score was settled with the

Latvian legionnaires who fought on the side of the German Army in World War II. Those who were destructive remained unknown. Minister of Internal Affairs A. Vaznis who spoke on Latvian TV conjectured that this was the work of the military carrying out the order of D. Yazov to eliminate monuments to "the fascists."

An investigation that is already under way will show whether the version of A. Vaznis is substantiated. Of course, it is not a particular fact that is at issue, but rather a principle, that is, our ineradicable desire to fight the dead.

By now, the sides are prepared to suffer human rather than gypsum losses. In Jelgava, participants in the events nearly parted with their own heads as a monument to Lenin was being torn down. In Klaipeda, a monument is guarded by armored personnel carriers with soldiers. The latter have orders to shoot if the "enemy" approaches.

Throughout the world, politicians from opposing states come to an agreement and wars come to an end at the negotiating table, but we still cannot make peace with our dead. We still cannot agree on who deserves to remain for all eternity and who does not. Could we, perhaps, let eternity itself sort this out?

P.S. On Monday, the Latvian parliament adopted a resolution on the protection of graves and tombstones.

Latvian Government Sponsors New Newspaper

LD2411030790 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1601 GMT 23 Nov 90

[By TASS correspondent Galina Kuchina]

[Text] Riga, 23 (TASS)—The first issue of DIENA (in translation to Russian—DEN) was published here today. It was founded by the Latvian legislature and government. However, as the editor of the DIENA newspaper has stated, it is an independent publication in the legal, economic and ideological sense, which seeks to occupy the central position on the political arena.

Ilmar Bisher, first deputy chairman of the republic Council of Ministers, notes on the pages of the new newspaper that "the truth cannot emerge in conditions of total unanimity and DIENA should help to come closer to the real truth".

CP-Appointed Press House Director Not Recognized

LD0112134990 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian 1400 GMT 28 Nov 90

[Excerpt] As we already reported, today at the Press House a new director reported for duty, who, just like the Communist Party of Latvia, whose instructions he is fulfilling, regards this house as the property of the Communist Party. But the work collective thinks otherwise. Today the sitting of the council of the work collective adopted a resolution whose content is simple: the people of the Press House recognize only the Latvian Newspaper and Journal Publishing House and the executive director appointed by the government of the Republic of Latvia, Kazimirs Dundurs. The government's view at this meeting was expressed by Minister of Administrative Affairs Karlis Licis. [Passage omitted]

Lithuania

Prunskiene Finnish Visit Continues 13 Dec

LD1312235590 Vilnius International Service in English 2230 GMT 13 Dec 90

[Text] The Lithuanian Premier Kazimiera Prunskiene, who is in the second day of her visit to Finland, met today her Finnish counterpart Mr. Harri Holkeri. During a news conference held after the meeting, Mrs. Prunskiene expressed the hope that the visit would promote the establishment of direct economic ties with Finland. She regretted, however, that while Finland was prepared to extend economic assistance, it was reserved in its assessment of Lithuania's political aspirations. Kazimiera Prunskiene reaffirmed that Lithuania did not intend to sign the new union treaty. She also remarked that the Western states could give more resolute backing to Lithuania's striving to achieve independence. The Lithuanian premier also met today Finland's communications minister and the country's businessmen, who expressed willingness to cooperate with Lithuania in the machine-building, chemical, and oil refining industries, as well as in electronics.

Legislative Delegation Visits France

LD0512235990 Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 2200 GMT 5 Dec 90

[Text] A group of Lithuanian legislators, headed by deputy chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Council Kazimieras Motieka had a meeting with the chairman of the French legislature, Laurent Fabius. According to Radio Free Europe, Fabius expressed his wish to visit the capitals of the Baltic states in January, and a group of French legislators intend to take part in the 16 February celebrations in Vilnius next year.

At a news conference after the meetings in Paris, a member of the French legislature, Michel [name indistinct], noted that in restoring cultural relations with Lithuania, one should regain the buildings of its diplomatic mission, where a cultural center could be set up. He noted that these buildings are at present being illegally occupied by the Soviet Union.

Lithuanian Legislators Visit Sweden

LD0612040990 Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 2200 GMT 5 Dec 90

[Text] A Lithuanian legislative delegation has been on a working visit in Sweden. It acquainted itself with the

work of the Swedish Riksdag, and with the process of adopting laws. At today's news conference, member of the Lithuanian delegation Bronius Kuzmickas, Supreme Council deputy chairman, called the visit an important part of returning to Europe. According to him, while the political situation in Europe is changing the situation in Sweden and other Scandinavian countries is undergoing a change too. They are seeking to develop cooperation with Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia with the aim of establishing a strong background for their future political and economic actitities. Bronius Kuzmickas favors a confederation of the Baltic republics where Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia would preserve their statehood but at the same time in some spheres, for instance, in foreign affairs have a common policy. He cited as an example the Nordic Council where five Scandinavian countries prepare and adopt common laws.

Lithuania's USSR Talks Positions Detailed

91UN0358A Moscow SOYUZ in Russian No 46, Nov 90 p 14

[Interview with B. Kuzmickas, deputy chairman of the Republic of Lithuania Supreme Council, by SOYUZ correspondent Gennadiy Litvintsev; date not given: "Independence Is Not a Subject for Negotiation"]

[Text] Vilnius—**As announced, negotiations between delegations of the USSR and Lithuania are to begin in the final days of November. The content of the preceding consultative meetings and the USSR Government's position were clarified to a considerable extent at a news conference given by N.I. Ryzhkov shown on Central Television's Channel I on 20 October. But what is the Lithuanian side's viewpoint on the questions that have been raised? This was the subject of our correspondent's interview with B. Kuzmickas, chairman of the Commission for the Political, Legal, and Diplomatic Preparation of Negotiations with the USSR and deputy chairman of the Republic of Lithuania Supreme Council.**

[Litvintsev] Prior to the official meetings in Moscow, the Republic of Lithuania leadership declared that it would not subscribe to the new Union treaty. Has there been a change in your position on this issue following the consultations with the Union Government? Do you concede that, given certain conditions, Lithuania could subscribe to the treaty?

[Kuzmickas] The Union treaty was doomed to fail from the start. Attempts to rescue a state created by violence and to impart a legitimate, more "democratic" nature to the current structures, if only on the basis of a confederation, are attempts to follow events. For Lithuania a Union treaty is unacceptable from the legal viewpoint also—before negotiating with anyone, it must restore state independence. In this connection the Soviet Union should recognize the illegality of Lithuania's incorporation within it in 1940.

A multitude of other questions also arises. What is the Union today? Who will conclude the treaty? Between whom? After all, the Soviet Union, as we were accustomed to seeing it, no longer exists. In its new form, even its contours are not yet in sight.

I concede that Lithuania's state confederal ties to neighboring states might emerge in the future. But this, I repeat, should be a matter for the free choice of self-determined peoples.

[Litvintsev] Might your words be understood to mean that, were an independent Lithuanian state to be legally recognized by the Soviet Union, the formal obstacles to subscription to the new Union treaty would thereby be lifted?

[Kuzmickas] I would not put it like that. Legal recognition of an independent Lithuania is one thing, participation in some interstate formations, another. The nature of the future ties to our neighbors will be suggested by actual reality. In any event, we should be guided here primarily by national interests and the rules of international law. Currently, however, who could vouch for the plan to create a new Union succeeding? What will be the nature of this Union? Who will be a part of it? Obtaining answers to these questions will take time. Independence, however, currently is not a subject for negotiation.

[Litvintsev] What, in this case, about the economy, in which integration relations, the interrepublic division of labor and intraunion prices are a reality? As you know, the USSR Supreme Soviet recently adopted the "Guidelines for Stabilization of the Economy and Transition to a Market Economy." Will Lithuania join in this process or will the economic reform in the Republic go its own way?

[Kuzmickas] We will act on the basis of expediency. It is obvious that we must have economic relations with the Soviet Union: The West will not accept us with open arms—we harbor no undue illusions here. Such relations will be all the more acceptable if economic agreements between the republics as equal partners operate in the reformed Union. We would in this case be disposed toward the conclusion of agreements both with the Union and horizontally, with the republics. The agreements would most likely differ from one another: We would sign with Russia on one set of terms; with Latvia, on another; with the Ukraine, on yet another. The Union Government will, most likely, disappear from the structure of the future Union. The center as it is now will prove unnecessary. In my opinion, the giant Soviet Union is altogether incapable of functioning efficiently. What could unite peoples with different cultural and historical traditions?

Thus Lithuania does not intend to subscribe to realization of the program adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet; this would be contrary to our proclaimed goal—restoration of state independence. Political independence presupposes also the independent solution of economic problems.

[Litvintsev] At the negotiations in Moscow, your delegation will be guided by Lithuania's national interests. This is natural. At the same time, however, national minorities—Poles, Russians—who see many problems in their own way and would like their opinion to be taken into consideration, reside in the Republic. Will representatives of these minorities be accorded observer rights, as Ryzhkov insists?

[Kuzmickas] Yes, such a wish was expressed on the part of the Soviet side, and quite insistently, it must be said. We asked: On what basis is this demand being made? Lithuania is a sovereign republic and it is competent to decide whom to include in the delegation. The national minorities have not been sidelined from the negotiations—their representatives participate in the work of expert groups and have an opportunity to express their interests. If the negotiations are to be conducted on an equal basis, the principle of parity should be observed in all things. Just imagine that we made the counter wish that, say, the Union delegation include the representatives of some political currents or public groups with their own particular opinion on the matters to be discussed.

[Litvintsev] As far as I understand it, it is a question of observers, not full members of the delegation. In addition, the subject of the negotiations hardly essentially affects any groups or political currents in the Soviet Union, whereas for Poles and Russians in Lithuania this is a decision on their entire future fate. The fact that the discussion is proceeding without their participation cannot, understandably, fail to disturb them.

[Kuzmickas] The Republic of Lithuania is a state of all inhabitants of Lithuania. The fate of Poles, Russians, Belorussians, and representatives of other nationalities in Lithuania is the fate of equal citizens in a state based on the rule of law. The more so in that Poles and Russians in Lithuania have all the conditions (schools, newspapers in their native language) for preservation of their national identity. But it is hard to imagine that these representatives would merely passively observe the negotiations, not interfering in its course, not making political capital from the mere fact of their participation in the negotiations, and not bringing pressure to bear. Consequently, the intention is to invite them so that they may make some political capital; we understand this. Rather, these representatives would express an opinion that it would be difficult to harmonize with the principle of the sovereignty and independence of the Lithuanian state. Yet it is for the sake of its affirmation that the negotiations are beginning. Furthermore, who would be considered representatives of the Russians and Poles in Lithuania? There are those who support Lithuania's independence; there are also those who are opposed. Whom to invite; to whom to entrust their selection?

[Litvintsev] Your response was negative, consequently?

[Kuzmickas] No. The issue has not been settled conclusively. But the Lithuanian delegation is insisting that all the legal aspects concerning the observers be clearly specified. Not to the detriment of our sovereignty and parity, of course.

[Litvintsev] Nonetheless, what is your view of the prospects of the negotiations—optimistic or not very?

[Kuzmickas] We are all approaching them hopefully, otherwise there would be no point starting them. The negotiations are in keeping with our main principle: achieving our goals only by peaceful, political, legal means—however long this might take. We know that this is the sole path toward Lithuania's independence.

While the material was being prepared for the press, the results of the Lithuanian delegation's negotiations on economic matters at a meeting of the USSR Council of Ministers Presidium on 10 November became known. K. Prunskene, prime minister of the Republic of Lithuania, described the situation at this meeting as "confrontational." "We proposed economic and trade agreements, but entirely different conditions were put to us: Unless we wish to live by the laws of the Soviet Union and participate in the currency fund, if we refuse to shape the budget together, and unless we wish to live as we have hitherto, in other words, if we reject Union republic status, there can be no question of any commercial agreements whatever. We found ourselves at the threshold on which we stood this past summer," K. Prunskene declared at a news conference in Vilnius. As is known, the Lithuanian delegation, having broken off the negotiations, walked out of the USSR Council of Ministers Presidium meeting.

Orenburg Oblast, Vilnius Sign Wheat Accord

LD0712090190 Vilnius Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 5 Dec 90

[Summary] The production association of the Ministry of Agriculture, MALIVA, has concluded an agreement of direct relations with the Council of Agro-Industrial Formations of Oremnburg Oblast in the Russian Federation. In exchange for industrial-technical goods, Orenburg Oblast will supply 7,500 tonnes of wheat and barley. This quantity of grain is sufficient to supply the needs of Vilnius in bakery products and groats for almost one month. The first consignment of wheat and barley is to arrive in Vilnius before Christmas.

Deputies' 'Discontent' With Leaders Noted

LD1512031390 Moscow TASS in English 2156 GMT 14 Dec 90

[By TASS correspondent Kazis Uscila]

[Text] Vilnius December 14 TASS—A number of deputies to the Lithuanian parliament demanded today the revision of the make-up of the Lithuanian delegation assigned to hold talks with Moscow.

Speaking in the course of a discussion of the political and economic situation in the republic, Academician

Jokubas Minkiavicius, the writer Vidamante Jasukaitite and several others stressed that the delegation either does not wish or cannot hold talks. This is why it is necessary to consider the revision of its make-up.

A critical tone of many speeches is evidence of the dissatisfaction with the performance of the government, as well as the parliament itself. Some speakers believe that the inactivity of the government is the root cause of all problems and accuse Prime Minister Kazimiera Prunskiene of numerous misdeeds, including the complicity in the activities of the Interlita firm, which engaged in machinations.

Others maintain that the parliament is pursuing a policy which is neither clever nor tactful. They denounce connivance with the "destruction of monuments and the whipping up of hysteria". Demands are being put forward that the make-up of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet and heads of permanent commissions should be revised, so that they include representatives of all groups.

The heated debate forced to postpone the adoption of a resolution on the problem discussed till the next week.

Leaders Hold News Conference on Blockade

PM1712120090 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 11 Dec 90 First Edition p 4

[Report by Captain Second Rank V. Gromak from Vilnius under the "Direct Line" rubric: "Gloomy Predictions"]

[Text] The difficult situation in Lithuania's economy was spoken of by vice premier A. Brazauskas at a recent news conference at the republic Council of Ministers. In the current year, he said, labor productivity has fallen considerably and the level of inflation has risen. He focused attention on the fact that a difficult winter lies ahead, "perhaps in the conditions of a tough blockade imposed by the USSR."

The news conference was also addressed by Prime Minister K. Prunskiene, who spoke about her trip to Germany and Switzerland. Journalists inquired about many matters, but chiefly wanted to know what the government thinks about the blockade and the coming winter.

It would be a very good thing if our relations with Moscow developed successfully through talks, K. Prunskiene noted. Lithuania "has no intention of attacking anyone, it is we who are being threatened." But if the threat materializes after all, we must have the means to combat it. As for the winter, K. Prunskiene and A. Brazauskas expressed confidence that it is possible to stand firm "even in blockade conditions, if we rally together."

Government Economic, Foreign Policies Criticized

PM0612160590 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 4 Dec 90 First Edition p 2

["Political commentary" by Captain Second Rank V. Gromak: "Lithuania: The People Do Not Count?"]

[Text] A few days ago the Lithuanian Government's Statistics Department informed the republic's inhabitants about the rise in market prices. In January-October this year prices rose by 36 percent compared with the same period last year. For example, the average price for 10 eggs is 3 rubles [R] 30 kopeks and for [a kilogram of] veal R13. "Rising prices, scarcity, shortage"—phrases such as these abound in the department's report. As other statistics on the Lithuanian economy's performance in recent months show, the republic's budget does not have enough sources of revenue.

Compared with 1989, national income fell by 10 percent and labor productivity by 9.2 percent. The destabilization of money circulation is continuing. Meanwhile, the Lithuanian Government is planning to introduce its own currency unit—the Lit. The money is being printed abroad and at great expense. The first batch of 400 million Lits cost $4 million to produce. Lithuania's printing presses are not adapted to printing money and it would cost $20 million to refit just one press. Add to that the cost of the paper, which is in short supply. The people are having to pay dearly for the ambitions of their "leaders" [vozhd]. Admittedly, they themselves are going without their salaries, cars, special rations and dachas...

Looking at some of them you can't help wondering: Was this the only reason that they needed independence? Is it not for such an independence and from a desire to "establish themselves by force" that they are hurriedly creating an Army to protect the country, and various security departments?

"A new state is being born," A. Butkievicius, general director of the national protection department, has stated. "Consequently we need forces which will protect the borders and important installations."

The fact that the strength of any state lies primarily in political and economic stability is not mentioned anywhere by the deputy. Perhaps he is unaware of this? Or perhaps, like his spiritual mentor V. Landsbergis, he sees this strength in the form of Western aid? But any request for or provision of help is unfortunately a form of dependence too.

The republic's press and television have given extensive and extravagant coverage to the foreign trips by V. Landsbergis and K. Prunskiene but observed a modest silence about their results. For the time being the West has not responded to the republic leadership's request for financial and material assistance. The U.S. Senate also refused Lithuania financial aid for 1991. Nor has Lithuania received any tankers of Swedish oil. I wonder

how the republic's leadership meant to pay for the oil? By what financial or political tribute?

The U.S. experts who visited Lithuania this summer concluded that for the next 10 years the goods currently produced here will be competitive only in the USSR market. It should not be forgotten that even in this market Lithuania will have very considerable competitors—Argentine beef and Australian lamb, not to mention industrial goods. Hopes for an agreement with Russia are, in my view, also unrealistic. Russia's people's deputies will hardly accept that raw materials should be sold to Lithuania at prices several times below the world price while buying Lithuanian output at triple the price.

"The official policy now being pursued," V. Shved, second secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party (CPSU) Central Committee, said, "has no future. The present government's attempts to stabilize the economy by leaving the Union are like trying to modernize an electric motor without plugging it in. But if the republic is going to receive raw materials at world prices, that will mean a contraction of the economy and a catastrophic decline in the working people's living standards. Because it is they who will have to pay the considerably increased bill for oil and coal."

People may object that both V. Shved's words and my own argument are "propaganda." But similar ideas are also being voiced by workers at the "Vilma" production association and peasants in Salcininkai Rayon. "The events which are developing here in Lithuania indicate that separatist nationalist forces are becoming increasingly prominent and that the ordinary people are suffering as a result," is the opinion of R. Denis, a worker at the Vilnius adding machine plant. "Political apathy reigns in Lithuania," says philosopher B. Genzjalis, who is not known for his sympathies toward the USSR. "Increasingly often I hear a lack of confidence in V. Landsbergis' policy from people who just 6 months ago supported him so fervently."

Three months ago the newspaper RESPUBLIKA published an appeal entitled "To the Lithuanian people." In it, well-known social and cultural figures in the republic warned: Democracy cannot be achieved by undemocratic methods. It also contained an appeal for a more sober look at the republic's present problems. A little later V. Petkievicius, the well known Lithuanian author and publicist and one of the founders of Sajudis, stated publicly: "Frankly speaking, the majority of my colleagues are disillusioned with or frightened by the processes now taking place in Lithuania. As the criticisms increase, the fine, peace-loving, and long-suffering image of our nation created behind closed doors by scheming politicians has been transformed into an ungrateful, blind mass with a short memory. To this should be added the well-rehearsed tactic of intimidation, revanchist tendencies, and anticommunist hysteria—and you have the situation that the intelligentsia finds itself in today."

There is more: "It is less than 6 months since Landsbergis 'ascended the throne,' and already anthologies of his speeches are being mass-produced. Like Lenin, Stalin, and Brezhnev before him, the most diverse documents are being entrusted to him as the number one..."

Meanwhile, the present Lithuanian political leaders have been visiting countries in Europe and America where they assure the world public that, having proclaimed Lithuania's independence from the USSR, they are building a democratic rule-of-law state and are ensuring the observance of human rights. But in that case what is one to make of the fact that more than 40,000 families, Lithuanians among them, have already applied to the Citizens' Committee for help in emigrating from Lithuania to republics of the Soviet Union?

A number of overtly fascist and profascist organizations—the Lithuanian Freedom League, the Union of Riflemen, "Young Lithuania," and the Neonationalist Party—have been revived in Lithuania and are on the rampage. On 22 November, many inhabitants of Vilnius had their first glimpse of the new riflemen's uniform being worn by the burly young men escorting a coffin bearing the Lithuanian army's unknown soldier. This uniform is very reminiscent of fascist uniforms. And the burial ceremony was somewhat redolent of events in Germany in 1933.

The real way to improve the catastrophic economic situation is to sit down and hold talks with the Union. As is well known, on 9 July, just 11 days after the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet imposed a moratorium on the act of independence, a state delegation headed by N. Ryzhkov was set up by USSR Presidential decree. But the Lithuanian leaders have been in no hurry to respond.

As it now emerges, the delay was used to hide the struggle in the Lithuanian legislature between the two approaches to the holding of talks. Briefly, it boils down to the fact that V. Landsbergis wanted to negotiate with Russia first but K. Prunskiene preferred to deal wth the Union government. A number of deputies have sharply condemned the fact that the talks were dragged out last summer. In an interview in EKHO LITVY, Academician E. Vilkas, an eminent Lithuanian deputy, said: "We have no other way of achieving independence than negotiation.. Clearly during the talks there will be an attempt to somehow bind us to the Union. But I am sure that this need not be feared because we are bound to it by nature itself... It is better to have good, friendly relations with the Union. And such relations are possible if we not only defend our own interests but also try to take into account the interests of the Union."

The position of the pragmatists from the political "center" in the Lithuanian legislature are fiercely attacked by the "intransigents," who call the Union nothing less than an empire intent on swallowing up the Baltic region again, and who prefer to wait for what they see as inevitable catastrophe.

And here, to divert the Lithuanian population from the vital and urgent problems of the present day, the nationalists and separatists are resorting to political blackmail, moral terror, and propaganda deception. In Taurage, an attempt was made on the life of V. Shved, second secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee. Near the party rayon committee building he was greeted by a rampaging mob of Lithuanian nationalists summoned there by the Sajudis leadership. Nor is there any letup in the acts of provocation against military servicemen and members of their families. All this is against the background of the concrete steps to create a Lithuanian "liberation army." It has been stated that it is declaring a holy war against the "Russian occupiers."

But among the people, I repeat, there is a growing disillusionment with the policy of the republic's present leadership and its ambitious course. More and more people are asking with concern: Is this the way to go?

The times are passing quickly. It may be years before a verdict is passed on these times—as to who was right in this extremely complex situation that Lithuanian is going through. May it not be too late...

Lithuanian Language Requirements Deferred

PM1312110990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Dec 90 Second Edition p 4

[Report by correspondent Yu. Stroganov: "Language... Compromise"]

[Text] Vilnius—In approximately a year's time requirements for a knowledge of the state language of Lithuania and the transition to transacting business in it should have entered into force. The requirements which, it must be said, are quite tough, have met with a certain resistance. Now the republic's Supreme Soviet has made concessions. In particular it has resolved that in cities and villages where the majority of inhabitants consist of "the population which speaks another language," minimum requirements for a knowledge of the state language be applied to leading workers at state enterprises, institutions, and organizations and also to workers in the services sphere by 1 January 1995.

It has been decided not to apply the requirements for a knowledge of the state language to workers whose posts or work do not require them to have constant contacts with the population or to transact business. The deadline for transition to the transaction of business in the state language for enterprises, institutions, and organizations of cities and settlements of Lithuanian where the population speaking another language makes up the majority can if they so desire and with agreement from the state language inspectorate be extended to 1 January 1995.

Ozolas Rebuffs Freedom League Criticism

91UN0411B Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian 13 Nov 90 p 1

["Statement of Romualdas Ozolas"—EKHO LITVY headline]

[Text] **Romualdas Ozolas, deputy prime minister of the Republic of Lithuania, sent the following statement to the Republic of Lithuania Government information service:**

Several days ago the Lithuanian Freedom League resumed its permanent picket. The Lithuanian press and the television and radio of the whole world have been carrying a statement that I have not fulfilled my promise to fundamentally renew the government of the Republic.

In conjunction with this, I must declare that in October I was commissioned to meet representatives of the picket organized by the Lithuanian Freedom League near the administration building. I listened to their wants and demands. The leadership of the government has responded to some of them; it considered others of them unreasonable. During the meeting, we managed to agree that the leaders of the picket would meet with authorized representatives of the government before undertaking further actions.

Unfortunately, during the last days of October, an inquiry was circulated at the Supreme Council and, on 4 November, Kaunas Television broadcast the aforementioned statement.

The public undoubtedly knows that a proposal to reorganize the government is only made by the prime minister. I declare that I did not try to undertake this by any means, including those of which the Lithuanian Freedom League has accused me. The right to change members of the government does not belong to either the Lithuanian Freedom League or to any of its leaders; only the Supreme Council has that right. The government's attempts to nonetheless ascertain the rational intentions of the picketers ended in failure—the transition to the proposed forms of cooperation did not take place.

This is only worthy of regret, not of justification. At a time when Lithuania is trying to concentrate on fundamental decisions concerning methods for carrying out privatization and economic reforms and when maximum attention is needed for negotiations with the USSR and for consolidation of its position in the world, the actions of those who are organizing and carrying out the picket are destructive.

In addition, I express regret that the Republic of Lithuania Supreme Council has not had the opportunity to pass a law regulating procedures for pickets and demonstrations. I also wish to emphasize once more that even during the most heated conflict of opinions we should not forget about respect or self-respect.

Deputy Defense Minister Interviewed on Army

AU2711140790 Berlin DER MORGEN in German 24-25 Nov 90 p 4

[Interview with Lithuanian Deputy Defense Minister Algimantas Vaitkaitis by Chris Schmitz; place and date not given: "We Would Not Be Able To Put Up Resistance to Our Neighbors Anyway"]

[Text] [Schmitz] What is the current situation with regard to the creation of individual armed organs in Lithuania?

[Vaitkaitis] We do not want an escalation in our relations with Moscow, but we have to think of the future, which for us can only mean independence or the assumption of responsibility for our own defense. In many respects, whether in the material or personnel sector, we still do not have the opportunities to develop our own army. At present, the securing of our economic borders is the key question, since we have to prevent the sellout of our republic to the USSR. Moreover, it is important to ensure and to comprehensibly develop civil defense and rescue services, for example, a fire- brigade.

[Schmitz] A draft registration law is currently being discussed in the Lithuanian legislature, while the draft campaign of the Soviet Army is being carried out in parallel. Posters with the request to stay away from the Soviet Army were put up in Lithuania's streets. Can you guarantee the safety of the draftees if they do not submit to the draft registration and instead hide in the country?

[Vaitkaitis] It is true that we still do not have the authority to protect our draftees from the Soviet Army. However, only 8,000 of the 12,000 men who were ordered to report to the recruiting station did. But when they were actually drafted, only 1,114 Lithuanian citizens, among them 369 Lithuanians, came. They are virtually no longer persecuted and even the Lithuanian soldiers who now escape from the Army are left alone in many cases.

We are currently discussing a draft registration law. Unfortunately we are still unable to discuss a military service law since other statutes, another command staff, and not least further negotiations with Moscow are required for this.

[Schmitz] You have referred to new commanders. Will you also take over Soviet Army officers?

[Vaitkaitis] I myself was a colonel in the Soviet Army and served in it for more than 30 years.

[Schmitz] Which armies could you imagine especially supporting the development of your own army?

[Vaitkaitis] I have personally acquainted myself with the structure and functioning of the armies of Austria, Switzerland, and some Scandinavian countries. I think that the model of the Austrian Army comes closest to our ideas. Austria is a neutral country, a status for which we are also striving. Therefore, the orientation of the army also corresponds to these ideas. The same applies to the Swedes. But we do not want just to copy an army. We will look around carefully, in order to take the best from everyone.

[Schmitz] Agricultural circles in your republic are looking with envy at the agricultural equipment—so urgently needed in Lithuania—of formerly East German producers, which is beginning to rust in the fields of the new laender after the arrival of new West German equipment. Are you considering buying equipment from the former National Peoples' Army?

[Vaitkaitis] We must be interested in the procurement of military technology. I have repeatedly met with the first deputy defense minister of the USSR lately and I also mentioned the allotment of military technology. In 1940 we took a considerable amount of military technology, which was often more modern than the Soviet one, to the Soviet Army. In connection with the contributions we had to make as a republic to this Army for 50 years, we proceed on the assumption that part of the Soviet Army technology currently deployed here would be left to us. Our labor productivity was always higher than in the rest of the USSR and our population density is twice as high as in the Soviet Union. The Army also benefited from all these facts and this also gives us the moral right to make our demands.

Of course, we will deal with foreign military technology later. By the way, our army need not consume our state budget, since we are anyway neither able nor willing to fight against our neighbors, whether the Soviet Union, the Poles, or the reunified Germany. Like the Finnish Army, our Army is to solve local security tasks. Unfortunately, our neighbors often enough represented their interests with the help of our territory or directly by it. We hope that in the future our neighbors will get together with us more because of economic interests.

By the way, the first 100 uniforms have already been sewn. We selected them from a catalogue of international uniforms.

[Schmitz] It often seems as if Lithuania wants to open its borders to Europe and close them to the East. Do you already know how the political borders will be secured?

[Vaitkaitis] Depending on the respective neighbor and his attitude toward us, the borders might be absolutely different. On the one hand, we have the border with the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, the former northern part of East Prussia, the border with Poland—maybe a completely open one—the border with Belorussia, and another one with our northern neighbor, Latvia. With the USSR we do not want such a border, which we have always regarded as a nuisance. However, as has been observed so far, a major difference in economic productivity and product quality would inevitably result in the outflow of food and consumer goods to Russia and Belorussia, which we simply cannot afford.

[Schmitz] How long will the basic military service in the Lithuanian Army be?

[Vaitkaitis] Service in the Army will take 12 months and alternative military service will take 24 months.

Lithuanian Legislator Views Independence

AU2711141890 Berlin DER MORGEN in German 23 Nov 90 p 3

[Interview with Aleksandras Abisala, Lithuanian legislative spokesman and member of the delegation for the clarification of independence, by Chris Schmitz; place and date not given: "The Two-Plus-Four Treaty Makes Us Forever a Part of the Soviet Union"]

[Text] [Schmitz] There are no longer so many reports on Lithuania's aspirations to become independent of Moscow. Is there suddenly agreement on the future course?

[Abisala] This would be just lovely! However, at the moment, Moscow does not seem to realize that nothing holds us within this union of "free" Soviet republics any longer. We are in a very critical situation. Many things will depend on this month because consultations that are to prepare the talks on independence are held in Moscow. Moscow wants to immediately start negotiations, in order to freeze our independence, as agreed, and to defer it without any plan or objective together with the negotiations of other territories of the Soviet Union, which often only call for little more self-determination. But we, on our part, press for consultations which, according to the international practice, are to define a protocol for the negotiations.

[Schmitz] What matters for negotiation are currently most difficult?

[Abisala] First it has to be clarified what will be negotiated and what we, as representatives of Lithuania, are: representatives of a country or of a region within the Soviet Union.

[Schmitz] But the desired political independence cannot be reached without an economic detachment?

[Abisala] Of course, it is almost impossible for us to buy the raw materials that have been supplied so far against foreign exchange now. If Moscow were to press for this, we would also have to sell our products against foreign exchange.

Concerning the blockade, Moscow suffered far more damage than Lithuania. As you know, Lithuania supplies several Russian metropoles with agricultural products. At that time, there was even the joke that the difference between the blockade of Leningrad during World War II and the blockade of Lithuania was that the starving people in Leningrad were inside the blockaded area.

[Schmitz] Mr. Abisala, a sore point for the Lithuanians is the attitude of the world public toward Lithuania's independence aspirations. Do you currently have any support?

[Abisala] No country should fall out with Moscow because of us, but the solution of one problem does not obliterate the others. After having achieved our independence on 11 March, we had the moral support of some legislatures, among them the U.S. Congress. However, at present, political and material support would help us very much. Cautious steps in this direction are made by the Scandinavian countries and Iceland. But we had to learn over the past 50 years that in the end we can only rely on ourselves.

[Schmitz] How do you assess Germany's attitude in this context?

[Abisala] Germany extradited us with the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact in 1939, the "two-plus-four treaty" establishes the European borders forever, and it thus makes us forever a part of the Soviet Union. Therefore, we sent notes to Moscow, many other countries, and the United Nations in which it is pointed out that we did not authorize any country, not even the Soviet Union, to sign something for us.

As for Germany, we understand that you have your own problems there, but our people are disappointed since they also placed some hopes in the Germans. One has the impression that even German politicians are wearing blinders at present.

[Schmitz] Many countries regard this treaty as Germany's final renunciation of former German territories in the East.

[Abisala] Of course, the danger that Germany claims the former "Memel Strip," which was inhabited by Germans for 700 years, would also theoretically arise for us. However, Moscow currently threatens us much more with territorial claims. As regards the former East Prussia, that is, exactly the part that is Russian today and borders on Lithuania, many Lithuanians think that it might not be so bad to have such a highly developed country as Germany as a neighbor.

[Schmitz] You talked of a threat from Moscow. What territories of Lithuania are claimed?

[Abisala] Immediately after 12 March, Gorbachev told us that the "Memel Strip" has never been part of Lithuania and is not part of it today. He does not want to discuss this with us, but he only threatens with this problem in case of our withdrawal from the Soviet Union.

The Poles and even more the Belorussians are broaching territorial claims in the south and in the east, wherever there is said to be a superiority of Polish and Belorussian culture. There is even a declaration to this effect of the former Presidium of the Belorussian Supreme Soviet.

Perhaps this is even natural, we were the first to declare our independence and everyone is going after us now.

[Schmitz] In other words, except for the northern neighbor, Latvia, all other neighbors have laid claim to Lithuanian territory?

[Abisala] One can proceed on the assumption that this turmoil has been initiated by Moscow. Warsaw has officially stated that it does not claim any territory from Lithuania. The question of Silesia has surely played a certain role here. The present leaderships in Minsk and Vilnius have come to a similar agreement.

[Schmitz] How many people do not necessarily advocate independence?

[Abisala] Of course, in our country there are also people who do not think of tomorrow as long as they can buy gasoline and beer and do not have to make special efforts at work. On the whole, one can proceed on the assumption that more than 90 percent of the Lithuanians, who account for 80 percent of the republic's population, are in favor of complete independence. Of the two minorities next in size, the Poles and the Russians, 75 and 50 percent respectively advocate a free Lithuanian republic.

Moscow still has power over us, but we do not want a situation as in Caucasus or Moldavia. We will detach ourselves from the Soviet Union without violence.

Talks Held on Lithuanians Serving in Soviet Army

LD2111104590 Vilnius International Service in English 2230 GMT 20 Nov 90

[Text] Lithuanian and Soviet expert groups had consultations on army and defense issues, in Moscow.

The experts discussed the future of Lithuanian-Soviet relations in the sphere of defense, the temporary status of the Soviet troops stationed in Lithuania, and the problem of Lithuanian citizens who refuse to serve in the army of a foreign country.

It was agreed to set up two joint commissions to work on these issues. The results of the work are to be discussed at a meeting of the expert groups early in December. At yesterday's meeting, the head of the Soviet expert group, General Moiseyev, assured that no violence would be used against army evaders in Lithuania while the Lithuanian expert group headed by the (?deputy) defense department director, Audrius Butkevicius, said that the Lithuanian Government would not put any obstacles for those who had decided to serve in the Soviet Army.

Economists Warn Against 'Hastily Drafted' Laws

LD0612160190 Moscow TASS in English 1441 GMT 6 Dec 90

[By TASS correspondent Serafim Bykhun]

[Text] Vilnius December 6 TASS—A group of leading Lithuanian economists has warned the republic's parliament against making hastily drafted economic decisions.

The economists, who include Eduardas Vilkas, Kazimeras Antanavicus, Arvidas Lesinskas, Vladas Terliackas and Audrus Rudis, wrote in the statement: "We draw the attention of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet to an abnormal situation in passing laws and decisions on economic issues.

"Aware of the consequences of the fulfilment of hastily drafted laws and decisions, we declare that we want no part in discussing and adopting laws on economic issues, unless they are approved in appropriate economy-related commissions. We also declare that all responsibility for the consequences rests with the deputies of the Supreme Soviet who voted for the adoption of such laws and decisions."

A sharp drop in production, the shortage of and steep rise in prices on first necessity goods are exacerbating social tensions in Lithuania. Many Lithuanians are worried by that fact that the leadership is agreeing neither to talks with the Soviet Union nor to discussions of the draft treaty of the union.

Many people are concerned that the government has not yet come up with a clear programme for economic reform and that the laws which the Supreme Soviet passes are flawed.

Procurator on Soviet Interior Ministry Changes

LD0312201690 Vilnius Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 3 Dec 90

[Interview with Lithuanian Procurator General Arturas Paulauskas by unidentified correspondent; date and place not given—recorded]

[Excerpts] [Paulauskas] We are currently going through a time when—and I think that since the start of the existence of our republic on 11 March, this is already the second time—when the destiny of the republic itself is being decided. Once again we can see the aggravation of relationship with the military, all sorts of provocations, and what worries us is that all of this is done as though it is being organized from somewhere, from one center, that somewhere it is felt as though the same hand is in control over all this. But our people should not give in to these emotions and provocations; they must remain as cool as they were during the first days. [passage omitted]

[Correspondent] In the place of Internal Affairs Minister Bakatin, a new minister of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs has been appointed. This is Pugo, and his deputy is Boris Gromov. Is he the same Gromov who was chief commander of the Armed Forces in Afghanistan?

[Paulauskas] I cannot give you a definite answer on this. [passage omitted] Perhaps he is the same Gromov, because the interior troops now are taking an extensive

part in the conflicts both interethnic conflicts and ethnic conflicts as well. So probably this is a reinforcement of the leadership of the Interior Ministry troops.

Minister Bakatin was outstanding among his colleagues for his point of view and his erudition. [passage indistinct] He used to solve conflicts wisely, somehow he approached the independence of our republic, the sovereignty of republics with respect. He respected the right to self-determination and we somehow felt this. If we compare the actions of former Procurator General Sukharev and Minister Bakatin, then we get two opposite and mutually exclusive persons.

I think that again the appointment of Minister Pugo probably indicates that preparation for some actions, for some extreme actions is under way. [words indistinct] At a glance, at least having recognized the names of the appointed people, this causes concern and makes us think. [passage omitted]

Brazauskas Premieres New Radio Program

LD2311172490 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1400 GMT 23 Nov 90

[Excerpts] [Announcer] The "Government Microphone" is a new program broadcast by the Vilnius radio information editorial office. It premieres today. Permenently, on a weekday at 1600 (1400 GMT] we will try to inform you about the work of the republican government.

Today Deputy Prime Minister Algirdas Brazauskas is at the microphone:

[Brazauskas] I am once again speaking on the radio. I am speaking from the Council of Ministers, in my office. I understand that the republic's radio is ready to grant us an opportunity to speak for several minutes each week on topics which are important to the people of Lithuania. [passage omitted]

Many representatives of firms and businessmen who are interested in the maintenance or establishment of contacts now come to Lithuania. Last Monday and Thursday at Council of Ministers meetings we practically formed a package of the most important possible investments in our republic's economy. [passage omitted]

We pay attention, above all, to the satisfactio of people's needs. This applies to the food industry. The situation today is, one may say, deplorable. Technology which is in use in the milk and meat industry, especially in the production of canned products,is substantially lagging behind. [passage omitted] We have substantially advanced forward in laying the foundations of assembling motor vehicles in Lithuania, possibly small tonnage vans and tractors. [passage omitted]

The problem of trade relations with other republics is very urgent. We have signed agreements with small republics, some republics in Transcaucasia and Central Asia. At present it is very important to sign agreements with Belorussia and the Ukraine and, of course,with the Russian Federation which is a very important partner. The situation vis-a-vis union organizations is very tense. [passage omitted]

About the possible blockade—I would not like to use this word. We can speak about the blockade when we know for sure what our relations with these state organizations will be. Of course one must think about how to live. We are preparing and have instructed various departments and organizations how to accumulate rsources,fuel, goods and food products. The winter may be difficult. This would make our situation more difficult and therefore we are preparing for it. A thorough and consistent work, familar with our economy, is essential.

Reports of Soviets Jamming Broadcasts Invited

LD3011131590 Vilnius International Service in English 2230 GMT 29 Nov 90

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] We have mentioned on many occasions in the past that so far Radio Vilnius uses the transmitters located on Soviet territory to relay its broadcasts overseas. The transmitters are located in a number of areas in neighboring Belorussia, Khabarovsk, Komsomolsk on the Amur, Blagoveshchensk, and so on. In other words our broadcasts depend entirely on our big eastern neighbor. The possibility that our broadcasts might be blocked in the near future cannot be ruled out. If this would happen it would be very much appreciated if you could inform us immediately. Our telephone number is: 660526, and the area code is 0122. I'll repeat it once again. Our telephone number is: 660526, and the area code is 0122. [passage omitted]

Lithuanian TV To Displace Moscow's Second Channel

PM0512124790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Nov 90 Union Edition p 2

[Nikolay Lashkevich under "Direct Line" rubric: "Second Television Channel in Lithuania"]

[Text] Vilnius—At the beginning of next year the inhabitants of Lithuania will be able to watch a second republic television channel instead of the Central Television Channel Two—this decision has been adopted by the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet Presidium.

Allocation of resources for planning and broadcasting the second Lithuanian television channel is provided for in the republic's budget. Total spending is estimated at more than 5.5 million rubles.

By means of two powerful satellite antennae Lithuanian television can pick up eight foreign programs.

"We will record these programs, and also interesting material from the Central Two and Leningrad channels—for instance, "The Fifth Wheel" and "600 Seconds"—and use them to compile a kind of television

digest of sociopolitical, news, educational, entertainment, and other programs," A. Kauspedas, deputy chairman of the Lithuanian Television and Radio Broadcasting Board, told me. "So we do not intend to refuse absolutely to show the Central Television second channel. We also intend to transmit the most important sessions of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet, programs by the Russian Television Company, and other Central Television broadcasts. At the moment we are resolving the juridical and technical problems of such transmissions.

The plan is for the new republic channel to go on the airwaves for 14 hours. By gradually including in it more and more of its own material, Lithuanian Television intends to create a second national [natsionalnyy] television channel.

New Lithuanian Radio, Television Heads Appointed

LD2111124990 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0100 GMT 21 Nov 90

[Summary] Algirdas Kauspedas, leader and singer of the rock group, Antis, has been appointed director of Lithuanian television.

Nerijus Maliukevicius was given the post of direct of Lithuanian Radio, while Edvinas Butkus has been appointed chief editor of Vilnius Radios foreign broadcasting.

Lithuanian Human Rights Association Founded

LD1612030190 Vilnius International Service in English 2230 GMT 15 Dec 90

[Text] The Lithuanian Human Rights Association held its founding congress in Vilnius today. The association will now unite the various public organizations concerned with the protection of human, political, economic, and social rights of the inhabitants of Lithuania, the Helsinki group, political prisoners and deportees, the Lithuanian Independence Union, the unions of the unemployed, the homeless, and many others. Chairman of the action group, Academician (Antanas Buracas), noted that the congress was held in the face of a new Soviet occupation and that the association could play an important role in the conditions of civil disobedience and resistance to the occupation. A board of 21 persons has been formed which will later elect the chairman of the new association.

Kaunas Demonstrators Picket Military

91UN0411G Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian 20 Nov 90 p 4

[ELTA article: "In a Peaceful Situation"]

[Text] Kaunas, 19 November (ELTA)—In response to an appeal by the Kaunas council of "Sajudis" and the Lithuanian National Youth Union, hundreds of residents of Kaunas gathered on Venibes Square at the Freedom monument on Sunday. The picketers set off from there for Shanchay, where barracks for troops stationed in Kaunas had been built back in the time of the tsars. Today the Soviet Army resides there.

Drawing themselves up before the gates of the barracks, the residents of Kaunas raised their placards calling upon the occupying Army to go home. In turn, the servicemen prepared their own placards in Lithuanian and Russian. Beyond the fences of the military units stood soldiers drawn up in combat equipment. They were young people, just like the picketers. As a result, a more peaceful dialogue soon started up between both sides. Several officers who opened the windows of the barracks, tried to break it off by chasing the soldiers. Even among the officers there were people who explained that the status of the military in Lithuania will not be decided by picketers, but at the negotiation table.

On Sunday the residents of Kaunas picketed near all units stationed on Yuozapavicius Prospect and in the center of the city, as well as at the headquarters of the division and the military commandant's office.

It was reported at the city directorate of internal affairs that there were no incidents between picketers and servicemen on Sunday.

Officer Training Course Advertises for Applicants

PM0512115390 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 2 Dec 90 Second Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "Lithuania: Officer Corps Being Created?"]

[Text] "Citizens of the Lithuanian Republic who have reserve officer or warrant officer rank, up to 30-years-old, and who have gained the trust of Lithuanian organs of power and social organizations can be admitted to officer courses. Applications and other documents can be submitted to the chief of the officer courses as of 1 December this year."

This advertisement appeared in the newspaper LIETUVOS RITAS on 30 November.

Statisticians Cite 'Black' Price List

PM2111103190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Nov 90 Union Edition p 1

[Report by correspondent N. Lashkevich: "What Things Cost in Lithuania"]

[Text] Vilnius—The statistics department under the government of the Lithuanian Republic has published a detailed index of retail prices in Lithuania.

The fact that prices in Lithuania are constantly rising is an open secret in the republic. Everyone has experienced this complex natural law himself. However, the collated

results of a selective statistical survey conducted recently in four cities in the republic—Vilnius, Kaunas, Rokiskis, and Silute—proved too depressing. A simple comparison of the index of prices for all nonfood goods in the third quarter of this year and last year graphically confirms yet again an obvious truth: Prices in Lithuania are becoming ungovernable, while the rate of inflation is continuing to grow rapidly. Statisticians maintain that the overall prices index stood at 107.6 percent.

Thus, the prices of cotton fabrics increased 17 percent. Women's clothes went up 13 percent, refrigerators, washing machines, and clocks and watches between four and seven percent, and black-and-white television sets 19 percent. The prices of school clothes leaped sharply. For example, parents now have to pay out twice as much as last year for a winter coat of artificial fur. However, even at such volatile prices the customer cannot acquire the necessary goods (they simply do not exist) and is forced to have recourse to the services of the "black market." It is essentially this that dictates the overall prices index today. It is evidently with due regard for this that the statistics department has for the first time cited the "black price list" so fully. For comparison: A man's raincoat costs three or four times as much as the state retail price, shoes cost seven times as much, a Minsk-15 refrigerator 5.5 times as much, an electric iron seven times as much, and a Feya washing machine 8.3 times as much.

It is only to be regretted that the statistics department did not include the wages index for the population of Lithuania alongside such a fascinating price list. It would be interesting to know by what percentage it has increased, compared with the third quarter of last year. I believe that this would be a really absorbing comparison, particularly on the threshold of the upcoming increase in the retail prices of foodstuffs...

Writer Criticizes Antisemitic Article

LD0412000790 Moscow TASS in English 2120 GMT 3 Dec 90

[By TASS correspondent Serafim Bykhun]

[Text] Vilnius December 4 TASS—Those in the media who stir up anti-semitic hysteria are conferring a dubious benefit upon the Lithuanian people and are distracting them from vital issues, said writer Grigoriy Kanovich, chairman of the Jewish Culture Society in Lithuania.

During a republican television appearance, he made a statement in connection with the publication of an anti-semitic article by Arunas Daugela in the Lithuanian newspapers PERSPEKTIVA and RESPUBLIKA.

The author of the article overtly calls for terrorising Jews and "expelling" them from Lithuania.

"The article by Arunas Daugela is not the figment of his fantasy but is someone's political order. It apparently also reflects the opinion of individual editorial boards of newspapers, since they provided space for publishing it," Kanovich emphasised.

It is significant that such articles appear of late in the press of not only Lithuania but other Baltic republics as well. As was already reported, an anti-semitic article by Henriks Kunsers, who accused "Jewish bankers" of "stealing wealth" from Letts, was published last week in the Riga-based PILSONIS, newspaper of the so-called Congress of the Citizens of the Latvian Republic.

Mavrik Wulfson, a USSR people's deputy from Latvia, described the article in PILSONIS as an "overt advocacy of Nazism" and as a serious blow against the international prestige of Latvia.

Caucasus

Georgia

Communist Party Issues Statement on Elections

91US0143A Tbilisi ZARYA VOSTOKA in Russian 4 Nov 90 p 1

[Statement signed by the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee on 3 November: "Statement of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee"—ZARYA VOSTOKA headline]

[Text] In conjunction with the preliminary results of the elections of deputies to the Georgian Supreme Soviet, the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee considers it necessary to state the following.

The harsh legacy of the past, the deformation of sociopolitical life, ideological dogmas, and many other factors on the one hand, and the severe sociopolitical processes of the present, the complexities of the radical renewal of the country, and economic and social vulnerability on the other hand, have significantly influenced the sociopolitical situation in Georgia and the consciousness and mood of a portion of the voters.

The Georgian Communist Party Central Committee believes that under such complicated circumstances a significant portion of the voters supported the Georgian Communist Party and its candidates in all the regions of the republic, for which we express our sincere gratitude to them. This has once more confirmed that the Georgian Communist Party is an influential political force in the republic. Our voters should trust that, having supported the Georgian Communist Party, they have voted for the sociopolitical and socioeconomic development of Georgia, civil peace, ethnic and interethnic harmony, and supremacy of national and universal ideals.

We express gratitude to all the candidates for deputy on our list who took part in the elections and clearly affirmed the multifaceted potential of the Georgian Communist Party. We congratulate those who have

already become deputies of the Supreme Soviet. We wish success to those 47 candidates for deputy who are continuing the struggle in second-round elections. We also thank the officials and people who supported our candidates for deputy.

The electoral campaign has entered its concluding phase. The Georgian Communist Party Central Committee expresses its trust that, in those districts where a second round or a runoff is being conducted and where candidates from the Georgian Communist Party are running for deputy, the voters will support those who by their experience, professionalism, and personal qualities will bring competency to the new Supreme Soviet.

It should be noted that during the entire preceding period the opposition has conducted a campaign to discredit the Georgian Communist Party and to show artificial animosity toward the authorities, sometimes in an intolerable form. Once more we wish to state that such opposition is groundless, as are the complaints lodged against the Georgian Communist Party in conjunction with the way elections were conducted. Over the last 18 months in a very difficult political situation we have managed to preserve civil peace in Georgia, localize individual points of tension, halt their tragic development, and resolve a whole series of political, demographic, ecological, and other issues not by way of confrontation but through the use of political methods alone. In a concept for ethnic development, in the new program statutes by which we are guided, and in our preelection program the Georgian Communist Party has clearly formed its new positions on the urgent problems of sociopolitical, economic, and social development. Recently at the legislative initiative of the Georgian Communist Party, the Supreme Soviet has adopted very important rulings which create a firm, legal basis for restoration of sovereign statehood and the resolution of other questions of considerable importance.

The Georgian Communist Party states that it is and will be the spokesman for genuinely ethnic interests and the aspirations of our people.

As before, we will stand alongside those who contribute genuinely and concretely to the radical renewal of all spheres of public life, to the restoration of state independence, to an economic and moral renaissance, to the defense of human rights, and to construction of a rule-of-law, democratic, free society worthy of a civilized people. To achieve this goal we will actively cooperate with everyone, including those parties and organizations whose worthy representatives did not end up in the legislature.

As before, the Georgian Communist Party will devote special attention to interethnic accord, the rights of the autonomous formation, and respect for the language, culture, traditions, and religious faith of all people residing in our country inasmuch as we fully realize that harmonization of interethnic relations, ethnic and religious tolerance, and ancient traditions of friendship and cohabitation have always been indispensable prerequisites of the peace and might of Georgia. So it should be in the future.

After the elections, the concluding stage of the 28th Congress of the Georgian Communist Party will take place; the Georgian Communist Party will analyze the sociopolitical situation and formulate basic trends in the activities of the party, elect the leading organs of the Communist Party, and decide important questions of its organizational and structural formation.

The Georgian Communist Party Central Committee truly believes that the sociopolitical processes taking place require even greater unification of our ranks inasmuch as a significant portion of society is with us as before and inasmuch as the ranks of the party are joined together by a common position and the wish of its numerous members to selflessly serve Georgia and the genuine interests and welfare of its people and to show by their deeds that today's generation of party members is loyal to universal, national, and democratic ideals and, together with all of society and with all progressive forces, is prepared to do everything for a peaceful, free, happy life and for construction of a strong and sovereign Georgia.

[Signed] The Georgian Communist Party Central Committee.

[Dated] 3 November 1990.

Second Round, Runoff Elections Held in Republic

Results Reviewed

91US0131B Tbilisi ZARYA VOSTOKA in Russian 13 Nov 90 p 1

[Report by Sokartvelo Information Agency: "A Corps of Deputies Has Been Formed"]

[Text] Runoff elections and a second round of the elections of deputies to the Supreme Soviet, the first round of which was held two weeks ago, took place in Georgia last Tuesday.

Day-long drizzle in Tbilisi and a sudden snowfall in many areas of the republic did nothing to reduce the heat of election struggle among political forces for seats in the new parliament of Georgia. Presentations on Georgian TV by the heads of political parties and blocs still contending for the credentials of deputies the day before set the tone for a new pick-up in public involvement. They outlined their programs once again, discussed vital problems and ways to solve them, and called on the voters to participate vigorously in the runoff and second-round elections.

Understandably, this time the choice was not as difficult as at the first stage of the struggle, as a result of which the number of candidates on the ballot was reduced considerably. In the 59 districts where runoff elections were

held, only two of the candidates who got the greatest numbers of votes of those who took part in the voting in the first round were on the ballot. Moreover, in some of them only one candidate remained, because their opponents had withdrawn. Therefore, they were already known to the voters, many of whom had made their choice. It was more complicated in the election precincts of the seven electoral districts where the second round of elections was held on that day, because two weeks ago elections were declared not to have occurred due to failure to record the participation of the necessary number of voters. In these precincts the names of all candidate deputies who were personally running appeared on the ballot. Incidentally, elections once again were determined not to have occurred in two election districts.

As we were told at the Central Electoral Commission, this time the elections also proceeded on the whole in an organized manner, without fuss, strictly in keeping with the law.

Late at night on 12 November the Central Electoral Commission summed up the results of runoff elections and the second round of voting. Here are the results. Based on the outcome of runoff elections, which were held in all the 59 electoral districts, and the second round of elections, held in five districts, representatives of the "Round Table-Free Georgia" bloc received 41 deputy seats, the People's Front of Georgia—11, the Communist Party of Georgia and the "Democratic Georgia" bloc—three each, the All-Georgian Rustaveli Society—one, and independent candidates—five.

Therefore, as a result of the two rounds of elections, the names of 246 deputies of the new parliament of Georgia are already known. Of these, 155 represent the "Round Table-Free Georgia" bloc, 64—the Communist Party of Georgia, 12—the People's Front of Georgia, four—the "Democratic Georgia" bloc, one each—the "Liberation and Economic Revival" bloc and the All-Georgia Rustaveli Society, and nine are independent deputies.

The Supreme Soviet of Georgia is embarking on its proceedings; the convocation of its first session is scheduled for 14 November.

The occupants of the remaining four seats in the Supreme Soviet of Georgia will be determined after repeat elections. In keeping with the law these should be held in the four election districts where elections were determined not to have been held: Gudautskiy Rayon, the city of Tkvarcheli, the city of Tskhinvali, and Dzhavskiy Rayon.

Communists Issue Statement

91US0131A Tbilisi ZARYA VOSTOKA in Russian 13 Nov 90 p 1

["Statement by Deputies of the Supreme Soviet of Georgia from the Communist Party of Georgia"—ZARYA VOSTOKA headline]

[Text] Multiparty elections in Georgia have come to an end. The population of the republic has expressed its will in the course of the elections, and on 14 November a new legislature will gather for its first session. This is an historic event, one more significant indication of a quantitative renewal in all spheres of sociopolitical life; its tremendous importance has yet to be appreciated.

Deputies of the Supreme Soviet from the independent, renewed Communist Party of Georgia congratulate all members of the new parliament on their election as deputies, and express their conviction that we will only be able to build a free, democratic, and just society, restore state independence, and achieve political, economic, social, and moral renaissance, civil peace, and national and interethnic accord through joint efforts, constructive cooperation with all progressive forces of society, and taking into account the interests of the Georgian, Abkhaz, Ossetian, and all other peoples residing in the republic. We would like to state with satisfaction that the election platforms of various sociopolitical organizations are based mainly on these very principles.

On this occasion we also express our heartfelt gratitude to the sufficiently large segment of voters who supported our party and who believe in it as a new national, progressive, and competent political force.

We are also aware of the full weight of our lofty responsibility to the motherland, because from among the 12 blocs and parties that took part in the elections, the voters gave the honor of delegation to the national legislature on party tickets to only two: "Round Table-Free Georgia" and the Communist Party of Georgia.

On the eve of the first session of the Supreme Soviet, we consider it our duty to state that we intend to vigorously participate in the work of the new parliament and play a constructive role in its activities. We have always subscribed and still subscribe to the principle that cooperation, mutual support by all sociopolitical forces, and their unification with a view to accomplishing the main tasks are a vital necessity in order to build the bright future of Georgia and its people. This applies to progressive forces both represented in the Supreme Soviet and those left outside its confines, among whom there are many worthy patriots.

When the interests of the nation, the entire republic, the entire people are at issue, we in the new legislature will always be among those articulating these interests, whatever the political climate.

We believe that the Supreme Soviet of Georgia will find correct ways to solve problems of vital significance for Georgia through legal and constructive actions, taking objective realities into account, being guided by tasks for the future, and by mutually reconciling reasonable, progressive, constructive, and realistic judgments. A search for these ways calls for judgments that are unbiased but

nonetheless respectful of the point of view of one's opponent, and mutual exchanges of views rather than opposition.

Cooperation and mutual support appear to be a necessity to us also because Georgia is now facing the most complex political, social, economic, and moral problems, which should gradually be solved through our joint efforts. We should not allow these difficulties to be exploited by someone in order to discredit the ideas of national and interethnic unity.

To our mind, the following should become one of the foremost tasks of the new Supreme Soviet, naturally, along with other vital issues: A fundamental transformation and the reforms of political, economic, and public life necessary to this end should take into account the vital interests of the entire people and its social security. A transition to a market economy should not bring about a deterioration in living conditions; nobody should be granted privileges, so that all members of our society will initially face more or less similar conditions.

We believe taking effective measures aimed at putting an end to dangerous violations of law which have become common here, restoring respect for the law, and ensuring the rule of law in all spheres of public life to be a task of special significance, because a civilized society will not be built where anarchy, chaos, and irresponsibility reign, where they disregard the primacy of legislation and laws.

For the sake of our people and its future generations, it is also necessary to resolve as soon as possible the issues of appropriate incentives for free and creative labor. We believe profoundly in the wisdom of Ilya Chavchavadze, who thought that courage is not displayed in hostility and bloodshed but in diligence and hard work. The future belongs to those who work, know how to safeguard the fruits of the labor of others, and retain the wealth of the past. Spiritual strength, knowledge, and skilled hands are the main point now. This is our path toward salvation.

We are embarking on discharging the extremely crucial responsibilities of deputies of the Georgia Supreme Soviet, while retaining our devotion to the supreme interests of Georgia, principles of unity and mutual support, constructive cooperation, realistic approaches, and Ilya Chavchavadze's view on the role of creative labor.

[Signed] Deputies of the Supreme Soviet of Georgia from the Communist Party of Georgia.

Results Assessed

91US01304 Tbilisi ZARYA VOSTOKA in Russian 17 Nov 90 p 3

[Article by Vladimir Gogidze: "Are We Predestined to Have a Two-Party System?"]

[Text] The political situation that has come about as a result of the elections to the Georgian Supreme Soviet requires detailed analysis. In no way do these comments pretend to aspire to this. We present just a "panoramic" sketch....

The main conclusion is unambiguous, without a doubt—the Communist Party, declaring over the course of decades that it was the leading and directive force, the vanguard encompassing the finest representatives of the people, has met with utter collapse. Even "one deputy less than 50 percent" would mean catastrophe for it, but "29 percent" looks like the epitaph on the gravestone of "communism."

Furthermore. Elections conceived of as being multiparty have turned out to be practically two-party. Why? It turns out that political pluralism cannot be introduced by a single decree or Law on Elections. Seventy years of existence within the rigid framework of the Soviet system cannot be erased from the people's consciousness. Especially since the elections conducted have been seen as an opportunity to get rid of a system universally regulatory in nature and a chance to take a decisive step along the path of acquiring genuine independence. And although all parties and electoral blocs vowed they would struggle to achieve these aims, people voted for the most selfless and decisive ones. The July blockade of the railroads served as a very weighty argument, though not the only one, in favor of "Round Table—Free Georgia." The transition of power into the hands of Zviad Gamsakhurdia and his adherents began as early as August—the elections simply concluded the process which had taken place in secret up until recently.

The leaders of parties and blocs participating in the elections and declaring that they would not join with "Round Table," so as to separately take more votes away from the communists, saw the results today: Two out of three votes which had been theirs went, in the final analysis, to the opposition, and the Georgian Communist Party got the third. This gives rise to two interrelated but outwardly contradictory hypotheses—that the majority of the new parties turned out to be not mature enough (and this is no surprise) to realistically assess the situation or know the mood of the masses, and that our social consciousness is not as yet completely ready for a multiparty system. Perhaps this is a "childhood disease," a transition period. But it is also possible Georgia has been preordained to have a two-party system in the future.

The polarized demarcation we see today can also be traced to other causes. Most of the people made their choice not among parties of the national liberation movement—and their designation as parties is still quite conditional—but based on the entirely dubious (judging from past experience) promise of the Communist Party to lead the country along the path towards slow and painful evolution from the Soviet system to the market and a rule-of-law state. From a Georgia that is part of a unitarian state to a Georgia that would supposedly be independent. On the other hand, this will entail a radical fracturing of the entire authoritarian-bureaucratic

system, the creation of national structures of power and government, and on this basis a struggle to achieve full independence and an orientation on Western values.

The majority voted for independence, but a majority of this majority link the success of the process with the name of the man who dedicated his entire life to struggling against the System. Without a doubt the people, the masses of people, condemn arrogant declarations on refusing to participate in the work of the new legislature because it is "insufficiently multiparty in nature," since they see the attainment of political pluralism as a secondary goal in comparison with achieving independence. Those who in their unofficial conversations risk using epithets such as "dark," "downtrodden," "backward," or even "void of deep traditions of legislature," should realize that the experience of introducing a multiparty system has succeeded in recent years only in Hungary, the former GDR, and Czechoslovakia, while voters in the Soviet Baltic region, Poland, and Bulgaria voted according to the "either-or" principle. And apparently this does not apply just to electoral systems and degree of sophistication of the laws.

Today we are still not prepared to provide an exhaustive analysis of this phenomenon, but this is no reason to be upset—time will put everything in its proper place. Yet something else is regrettable. Certain leaders of the national movement make statements at times which show that even they are not free of the influence of totalitarian ideology. Their claims to the role of father of the nation, statements that the Georgian people are electing legislators as masters of the country, a striving to again ideologize social life, to structure relations with state organs and the mass media on authoritarian principles, may be performing a nasty service. Georgia will not become an equal member of the international community as a free country without affording freedom to each of its citizens—political, economic, religious, and intellectual freedom. It is therefore particularly important today to eradicate traditions of paternalism, dictatorship, and intolerance. We must legislatively consolidate the role of the people as the source of power, the entity of authority, and create practical mechanisms of democracy. This task must be accomplished during the transition period parallel to the struggle for independence, since the people cannot become masters of their country unless each individual is a master.

Gamsakhurdia Discusses Supreme Soviet Tasks

91US0131C Tbilisi ZARYA VOSTOKA in Russian 13 Nov 90 p 1

[Article by Muradi Alashvili and Aleksey Sinelnikov: "On the First Session of the Supreme Soviet of Georgia; 'Round Table' Proposes an Agenda"]

[Text]

From the First Unofficial Meeting of the "Round Table-Free Georgia" Bloc Legislative Fraction

The first unofficial meeting of the legislative faction of the "Round Table-Free Georgia" bloc was held in Tbilisi yesterday. By this time, the main results of the second round of elections to the Supreme Soviet were already known. "Round Table" had once again won a convincing victory and ultimately gained almost two-thirds of the deputy seats.

Perhaps Zviad Gamsakhurdia was the only one who was not fully satisfied with the outcome of the elections.

He said: "Our goal was to gain 201 seats in the legislature; therefore, our victory is incomplete. And yet.... The outcome of the elections makes it possible for us to embark on our work. This outcome has made the center angry, as has been specifically expressed by the pages of IZVESTIYA. The agents of Moscow are the ones who are not happy at the outcome of the elections. The people of Georgia will duly rebuff them.... At the session, we will liberate ourselves from constitutional aggression."

Zviad Gamsakhurdia went on to outline a plan for amending the constitution of Georgia. It proposes amending its most odious provisions. Amendments will affect both the preamble, which will reflect the actual status of Georgia, and its principal articles.

Zviad Gamsakhurdia said: "We cannot go back to the constitution of the Democratic Republic of Georgia. It has on the whole become obsolete. However, we cannot just abolish the constitution of the Georgian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic], because in this case a constitutional vacuum will develop."

The leader of "Round Table" went on to dwell on the main tasks of the legislature. The main issue is to staff executive organs and select for leadership positions new cadres who have not compromised themselves. There is a cadre shortage.... This is why the efforts we made during the elections should be redoubled....

It was stressed at the meeting that the legislature should become a continuously operating organ of legislative power, exercise strict control over the actions of executive bodies, and ensure that the adopted laws are complied with. The "Round Table" deputies elected under a majority system should begin preparing for municipal elections in the field immediately.

Temur Koridze, who spoke at the meeting, put forth the concept of recreating a unified national ideology which, in his opinion, should replace the ideology of Marxism-Leninism. He said that the new ideology should be aimed at reviving Georgian national principles.

He expressed his conviction that in two to three years the empire as such will cease to exist, and Georgia should prepare for this....

Temur Koridze stressed: "We have never advocated confrontation; we have always desired national accord.

However, our adversaries will now increasingly place themselves in opposition to the Georgian national ideology. They will be left out of the national movement, and the people will turn away from them. As far as our mutual relations with the National Congress are concerned, we may state that our side will not set a precedent of confrontation...."

Zviad Gamsakhurdia responded to a question on the possibility of establishing the status of a colony for Georgia. He rejected this plan, stating that colonies do not have democratically elected parliaments.

Subsequently, Robert Petriashvili announced procedures for the holding of the first session of the new Supreme Soviet.

It is expected that the session will begin with a blessing by Catholicos-Patriarch of All Georgia the Most Holy and Beatific Iliya II. After the usual procedural issues, statements by the leaders of the Supreme Soviet and the Council of Ministers resigning their commissions are expected. The government is likely to be instructed to discharge its responsibilities until a new composition of the cabinet of ministers is put together.

On the same day, the chairman of the Supreme Soviet should be elected on a competitive basis. A policy statement by the new head of government is expected immediately after the votes are counted.

It is also expected that a law on a period of transition will be considered. Later the deputies will embark on adopting new symbols of the republic. "Round Table" proposes the following: a crimson-black-and-white flag; "Dideba" for the anthem, and a coat-of-arms depicting St. George.

The next item on the agenda is a decision on the de-party-ization of the working organs of the Supreme Soviet. It is also expected that appeals will be adopted to the legislators of the world, to participants in the All-European Conference in Paris, and to the Georgian people.

It is expected that the new tricolored flag of Georgia will be run up the flagpole of Government House on 14 November.

Newly Elected Legislature Holds First Session

Agenda Detailed

91US0142B Tbilisi ZARYA VOSTOKA in Russian 15 Nov 90 p 1

[Report by Sakartvelo Information Agency: "Georgia's New Supreme Soviet Has Started Its Work"]

[Text] On 14 November the work of the first session of the highest organ of state power in the republic, in the first convocation, started its work in the Georgian Supreme Soviet Hall of Meetings. Together with the new body of deputies, the first elected in multiparty elections since the establishment of Soviet power, the leaders of all the political parties and blocs that took part in the elections were also invited.

The session opened with a blessing from Catholicos-Patriarch of All Georgia the Most Holy and Beatific Iliya II. After exhorting the deputies to good work in the name of the unity of Georgia and its independence, he offered a prayer and presented the new Supreme Soviet a gift of a Bible and a "Resurrection" icon brought from Jerusalem.

The deputies observed a minute of silence in memory of all those who have given their lives in the struggle for Georgia's freedom and independence.

Then the session started its work. It was opened by the chairman of the Central Electoral Commission, Irakliy Zhordaniya, who reported the results of the election of deputies to the Supreme Soviet of Georgia.

The session elected a vote-counting commission and confirmed the interim regulations for the sessions of the Supreme Soviet.

Leading organs were elected for the session: its secretariat and the editorial and credentials commissions.

The secretariat is made up of deputies Alike Kobulashvili, Eteri Kavelashvili, Manana Gabashvili, Temur Dzhanelidze, Lovard Tukhashvili, Fotiy Chitlov, Nugzar Mamaladze, Merab Balardzhishvili, and Bezhan Abesadze.

The members of the editorial commission are deputies Amiran Kaladze, Nugzar Mgaloblishvili, Guram Petriashvili, Nodar Tsuleiskiri, Tedo Ninidze, Aleksandr Kavsadze, and Mindiya Ugrekhelidze.

The credentials commission is made up of deputies Bidzina Dangadze, Giya Pirtskhalaishvili, Avtandil Popiashvili, Dmitriy Keburiya, Liya Katsadze, Anri Kruashvili, Revaz Kemulariya, Sergey Rigvava, Bezhan Gonashvili, Mindiya Salukvadze, and Tristan Khaniashvili.

After a recess the chairman of the credentials commissions, deputy Bidzina Dangadze, presented its report.

The Supreme Soviet confirmed the powers of the newly elected deputies and passed a corresponding resolution.

The floor was given to the chairman of the Georgian SSR Council of Ministers, deputy Norad Chitanava, who announced that the Council of Ministers was relinquishing its powers in favor of the newly elected Supreme Soviet of Georgia.

Having taking this announcement under advisement, the session entrusted the government to continue fulfilling its obligations until a new Georgian Council of Ministers has been elected by the Supreme Soviet.

After this the deputies moved on the agenda for the 14-15 November session. Deputies Nodar Natadze and Nugzar Molodinashvili made introductory statements.

The following items were included on the agenda:

1. Election of the Supreme Soviet chairman.
2. A declaration in connection with the program statement of the Supreme Soviet chairman.
3. A law on the transitional period and corresponding changes and amendments to the constitution of the Georgian SSR.
4. An appeal to the peoples of the world.
5. An appeal to the Paris conference of heads of state and government of countries attending the Conference on Cooperation in Europe.
6. An appeal to all Georgia.
7. Election of a first deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet.
8. Defining the duties of the Supreme Soviet deputy chairman.
9. Election of a deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet.
10. Appointment of the chairman of the Council of Ministers.
11. The standing commissions of the Supreme Soviet.
12. Election of chairmen of the standing commissions of the Supreme Soviet.
13. The protection of human rights and strengthening law and order.
14. Work by appropriate standing commissions on priority tasks and resolutions.
15. Other business.

Deputy Mukhran Machavariani submitted a proposal on the first item of the agenda. Expressing the will of a majority of the deputies and of the republic's population, he proposed that the speaker of the "Roundtable—Free Georgia" bloc, Zviad Gamsakhurdia, be elected chairman of the Supreme Soviet of Georgia.

There were no other nominations for the post.

A recess was called, after which the leader of the secretariat, Aliko Kobulashvili, and the chairman of the editorial commission, Amiran Kaladze, spoke.

The floor was then given to the chairman of the vote-counting commission, deputy Vakhtangu Chitava. He announced the results of voting during the recess.

Zviad Gamsakhurdia was elected chairman of the Georgian Supreme Soviet by secret vote. The official statement of the vote-counting commission was unanimously approved to the accompaniment of stormy applause.

The chairman of the Georgian Supreme Soviet, deputy Zviad Gamsakhurdia, made a program statement.

Then the deputies moved on to review the question of the draft law on the announcement of the transitional period in the republic.

Opinions on this question were expressed by deputies David Kupreishvili, Sergey Rigvava, Temur Koridze, Giso Kordzadze, Nugzar Molodinashvili, Nodar Natadze, Avtandil Imnadze, Apollon Silagadze, Levan Aleksizde, Shalva Tsintsalashvili, Mindiya Salukvadze, Roman Gotsiridze, David Berdzenishvili, Gogi Gulbani, Tamaz Diasamidze, Tamaz Gamkrelidze, and others.

The Supreme Soviet passed a law on announcement of the transitional period in the republic to restore full state independence to Georgia, and it made appropriate changes to the republic constitution.

The deputies reviewed and unanimously passed a law to change the name of the republic. Henceforth it will be called the Republic of Georgia.

Deputy Nugzar Molodinashvili presented information on the draft laws on the state emblem, flag, and anthem of the Republic of Georgia.

Deputies Archil Mindiashvili, Avtandil Imnadze,Viktor Domukhovskiy, Zviad Dzidzigur, Ushangi Turashvili, Tengiz Bezhashvili, David Arevadze, and Roin Metreveli expressed their opinions on these drafts.

The session approved the new appurtenances of the Republic of Georgia.

The Supreme Soviet adopted appeals to the peoples of the world and to the Paris conference of heads of state and government of countries attending the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, and to all Georgia.

The chief of staff of the republic national association of Georgian officers, Duru Chitanava, greeted those attending the session on behalf of that association.

A moving statement was made by the editor of the newspaper SAMSHOBLO, Paati Natsvlishvili. He acquainted the deputies at the session with a bequest made by a companion-in-arms of Kakutsa Cholokashvili—Aleksandr Sulkhanishvili. Just a few days ago the Georgian people had committed to the earth the remains of the great patriot who lived in a foreign land for 66 years. His last wish was that the banner of Kakutsa be received by the newly elected parliament. Grateful descendants carried out the behest of their eminent forebear. To the accompaniment of a storm of applause the young Georgiy Gamsakhurdia and Archil Molodinashvili bore the banners of the Republic of Georgia and Kakutsa Cholokashvili into the hall.

Kote Potskhverashvili's "Dideba" was solemnly played. All stood.

With this, the first day of the session's work came to an end.

Meetings Continue 16 Nov

91US0137A Tbilisi ZARYA VOSTOKA in Russian 16 Nov 90 pp 1-2

[Report by GRUZINFORM (Sakartelo Information Agency): "First Session of Georgian Republic Supreme Soviet"]

[Text] On 15 November, the first session of the first convocation of the Republic of Georgia Supreme Soviet continued its work. The chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia, Deputy Eviad Gamsakhurdia, led the meeting.

The deputies considered and adopted a law on the introduction of position of deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia. In connection with this the corresponding changes and additions were made to the constitution (basic law) of the Republic of Georgia.

Deputy Akakiy Asatiani, chairman of the Union of Georgian Traditionalists and a member of the "Roundtable," was nominated for the post of deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia.

Participating in the discussion of his candidacy were deputies Natela Kuteliya, Lovard Tukhashvili, Guram Petriashvili, and Shalva Tsintsalashvili.

Speaking at the session, Akakiy Asatiani familiarized the deputies with his biography and answered questions.

The session unanimously elected Deputy Akakiy Asatiani as first deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia.

As we know, the position of Supreme Soviet Presidium secretary has not yet been envisioned by the constitution of the Republic of Georgia. In order to organize the activity of the Supreme Soviet and its apparatus, it was considered expedient to introduce the position of deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet.

Deputy Nemo Burchuladze, a member of the "Roundtable," was nominated for this position.

Deputies Avtandil Imnadze, Irine Taliashvili, and Avtandil Kvetenadze expressed their opinion regarding the proposed candidacy.

The session unanimously elected Deputy Nemo Burchuladze as deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet.

Then the deputies began to consider the question of appointing the chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Republic of Georgia.

Deputy Tengiz Sigua, a member of the "Roundtable" and president of the All-Georgian Rustaveli society, was nominated for this post.

Participating in the discussion of the proposed candidacy were Deputies Guram Makatsariya, Nikolay Khachapuridze, Tengiz Kitovani, Guram Kashakashvili, and Merab Balardzhishvili.

Speaking at the session, Deputy Tengiz Sigua made a statement of policy and answered questions.

The Supreme Soviet unanimously appointed Deputy Tengiz Sigua chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Republic of Georgia. He was instructed to present to the Supreme Soviet proposals concerning the structure and personnel composition of the Republic Council of Ministers, and the corresponding permanent commissions of the Supreme Soviet were instructed to submit to the Supreme Soviet conclusions on the structure and personnel composition of the government.

Before the beginning of the next meeting of the session, the deputies devoted a moment of silence to the memory of the hero of the National Liberation Movement of Georgia, Merab Kostav.

The hero's mother, Olga Demuriya-Kostava, having been invited to the podium, cordially welcomed and blessed the deputies of the national economy Supreme Soviet.

"Today is a great day," she said. "The dream of Zviad and Merab, the spiritual sons of the great Konstantine Gamsakhuridi, has come true. We have before us many obstacles and difficulties that we shall have to overcome. But God is with us. Unanimity is the most important thing now. Yes, God will bless us!"

Then the floor was turned over to the son of the first president of Democratic Georgia, Noe Zhoraniya—Redzheb Zhoraniya—who said:

"I was born in France, but I have always known that Georgia is my homeland. I am certain that the time will come when I will shake the hand of the future president of the free Republic of Georgia."

After this the session began to consider the question of permanent commissions of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia.

It was suggested that nine of these commissions be formed. Participating in the discussion of this issue were Deputies Nodar Natadze, Nikolay Khachapuridze, Roman Gotsiridze, David Kuprenshvili, Eldar Shengelaya, and Avtandil Margnani.

An emergency announcement about the difficult situation that had developed in a number of regions of Kakheti was delivered by the chief of the criminal investigation administration of the Republic Ministry of Internal Affairs, Grigoriy Shoniya.

The session formed a deputy group of representatives of political parties and organizations of the new legislature for immediate consideration of the situation that has developed.

Then the discussion of the question of permanent commissions was continued. Participating in it were Deputies Aliko Meladze, Paata Koguashvili, Mindiya Ugrekhelidze, Nugzar Mgaloblishvili, and David Goguadze.

The deputies adopted a decision to form permanent commissions of the Supreme Soviet and elected chairmen of these commissions.

The chairmen of the permanent commissions were instructed to submit proposals concerning the personnel composition of the commissions of which they are in charge.

The permanent commissions of the Supreme Soviet were instructed to develop drafts of urgent laws and decrees so that they could be submitted to the first session of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia.

The Supreme Soviet approved the Law on Making Certain Changes to the Constitution (Basic Law) of the Republic of Georgia.

A decree was adopted concerning the formation of a commission for preparing a draft of the new Constitution, and in this connection the political parties were invited to submit suggestions regarding the personnel of this commission.

Then Deputy Tamaz Obgadze familiarized participants in the session with the draft decree of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia concerning protection of human rights and strengthening of law and order, which was unanimously adopted.

The session considered and adopted the Law on the Effect of the USSR Law on Active Military Service on the Territory of Georgia.

The commander of the Georgian "Shevardeni" legion, Elgudzha Tsiklauri, and a student of the republic special secondary boarding school imeni K.N. Leselidze, Kakhaber Nakani, spoke at the session.

The decision to create a press center of the Supreme Soviet and also a Center for Information and Prognostication under the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia was announced.

Deputy Archil Nindiashvili spoke on behalf of the deputy group created because of the difficult operational situation in a number of regions of Kakheti. He reported on the first results of the work of this group and offered a number of concrete suggestions. The Supreme Soviet instructed the deputy group to continue the work it had begun and expressed confidence that the conflict that had arisen would be regulated through constructive dialogue.

Various questions and problems of the sociopolitical and socioeconomic life of the Republic were discussed by Deputies Guram Petriashvili, Viktor Domukhovskiy, Aliko Kobulashvili, Nodar Natadze, Avtandil Imnadze, Zaal Kakhiani, Gela Chorgolashvili, and Aleksandr Zhgenti.

The deputies devoted a moment of silence to the memory of Polio Gegeliya, a veteran of the national liberation movement of Georgia and a member of the "Roundtable," who died the day before.

The first session of the first convocation of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia will continue its work in the near future.

Gamsakhurdia Addresses Session

91US0136A Tbilisi ZARYA VOSTOKA in Russian 16 Nov 90 pp 1-2

[Unattributed report: "Speech of Zviad Gamsakhurdia, Chairman of the Republic of Georgia Supreme Soviet, at a Session of the Republic of Georgia Supreme Soviet"]

[Text] Esteemed deputies! Esteemed guests! Esteemed society!

Through the efforts of the national liberation movement and an uncompromising democratic opposition in Georgia, multiparty, democratic, non-Soviet elections have been held in our country for the first time. At those elections the Georgian people expressed their will and gave the mandate of their trust to the vanguard of the national liberation movement. The "Roundtable—Free Georgia" election bloc has won. I congratulate you, friends, on this victory.

The Georgian people have displayed enormous political maturity and an elevated sense of national and civic awareness. The Georgian people have shown that they are ready for freedom! We must express our profound gratitude to each Georgian, each loyal Georgian citizen, who took part in this election struggle, and to all those who worked and strove for the victory of the national forces, for this victory is a victory of principles and justice in our country.

At the same time, my friends, it should be noted that all of this is merely the beginning of a new and even more important and protracted fight that our people must win, and that is being called the resurrection of a free, independent Georgia from the dead!

I am deeply convinced, my friends, that a people who have held free elections at such a high level will be able to regain their lost statehood!

We must remember, my friends, that this victory is not the result of just one or two years of work and struggle. It is the culmination of the struggle that our movement has been waging since the 1950's.

Neither should we forget that the Georgian people have never reconciled themselves to slavery and loss of statehood. After the occupation and annexation of Georgia by Soviet Russia in 1921, even under conditions of the

world's most brutal and bloody communist dictatorship, the Georgian people continued their struggle for the restoration of their lost statehood, and today's victory is largely associated with the heroes who fell during that struggle. May their names live forever!

Proceeding from the present political, social, and economic situation in Georgia, today's session will focus attention on the following main issues. The first, fundamental issue that we must resolve is the question of constitutional reform during the transitional period, the creation of an interim fundamental law for the transitional period based on making changes and amendments to the existing constitution, and a declaration on the goals and tasks of the transitional period itself in the spheres of both legislative and executive power. The focus of our attention will be economic reform during the transitional period, laying the foundations of Georgia's economic independence and its emancipation from economic diktat by central planning, the formation of new political structures, a law on land, privatization, and the basic principles for the switch to a market economy, holding municipal elections, measures to remove party influence from law enforcement agencies and strengthen law and order, and reorganization of the system of culture and education.

My dear friends, as you are aware, despite its victory in the elections the national opposition is still not issuing a declaration of full state independence for Georgia, and this is because of the political realities existing in Georgia and in the world. We do not want our declaration of independence to remain merely a piece of paper; we want real independence, in which the necessary fundamental preparations have been made from the juridical-legal, political, and economic standpoints.

We have repeatedly said that despite Georgia's annexation in 1921, the government of the Georgian Democratic Republic did not sign any article of capitulation, and because of this, from a legal standpoint an independent Georgian state and its constitution still exist, regardless of the fact that the effect of that constitution was temporarily halted as a result of the annexation. Georgia's territory is still one and indivisible and the constitution of no foreign state, including the USSR Constitutions of 1936 and 1978, has any legal standing. True, the Soviet empire used force to foist its constitution on Georgia, but in our opinion, even to this day, its has no force, either in practice or legally. But today, as the result of mass protests by the national liberation movement and of the holding of non-Soviet elections in Georgia, this kind of actual force is also being gradual deprived of its foundations. The first proof of this is that for the first time throughout the entire Soviet period, elections in Georgia have been held outside the regulation of the Soviet Constitution, and the registration of parties was done not by organs of state management, but by the Central Electoral Commission, that was staffed on the principle of parity. Moreover, this registration was also not regulated by the existing constitution. This is an enormous achievement by the national liberation movement. My friends, today the whole world has been astonished by this achievement!

This time we face two choices. Restoration of the constitution drawn up by the social democratic powers of independent Georgia and reinstituting the force of that constitution will not produce the desired result since it will be difficult to adapt it to the present situation. Moreover, it does not contain any legal mechanism that provides protection against the imperial constitution, such as is contained in the form used in Article 77 of the existing constitution.

Proceeding from this, in our opinion an interim fundamental law for the transitional period should, nevertheless, be based on the existing constitution by making fundamental changes and amendments to it, so as not to create a constitutional vacuum before the new constitution that will be the foundation of the independent Georgian state gets drafted. This is also the reason for the change of the name of the Georgian Soviet Socialist Republic, which is a reflection of real changes in the political structures, and also the restoration of the national flag and national anthem. In order to reflect the real political situation that has been created, we must change the preamble of the old constitution, and all references to "Soviet Socialist Republic," "building of communism," "communist indoctrination" and so forth must be removed. It is necessary to devise new formulations for Articles 68, 77, 180, and 188, and to totally remove Articles 3, 9, 14, 15, 16, 20, 23, 30, and 61, and the second parts of Articles 8, 34, 38, and 74 from the constitution, and the formulation of Article 58 must be changed.

As far as the Soviet Constitution is concerned, during the transitional period it will be made completely harmless and in fact will not be in force on Georgian territory; our justification for that is provided by Article 77 of the Georgian Constitution, and by the time independence is proclaimed the Soviet Constitution will no longer be legally in force and the national constitution of Georgia will go into force; that constitution will be drawn up during the transitional period and it will provide for a legal mechanism to restore the independent statehood of Georgia.

My dear friends, the national liberation movement in Georgia continues. Only now its second stage is beginning, following the election of the vanguard of our movement—the "Roundtable"—to the highest legislative power by a decisive majority of the Georgian population. The very fact of the holding of multiparty non-Soviet elections under the conditions of annexation is an enormous act of national and civil disobedience because until now elections in reality have been held only in accordance with a pseudoelectoral system and diktat imposed by the center. Our movement has achieved the election of a truly multiparty legislature that will not only be the highest legislative power in our

country, but also the leader and coordinator of and at the same time the fundamental legal institution for engaging in national disobedience.

We shall respond to any legislative or administrative interference by the center in the internal affairs of our country with powerful acts of national and civil disobedience, so that the center of empire will be unable to impose its diktat. This will continue throughout the transitional period. We recognize only international law and we shall base our country's domestic legislation on that. True, today we already hold power, but with respect to the center we remain an opposition.

A call has been made to us from the opposition camp immediately to proclaim Georgia a colonial country and ourselves an organ of colonial self-management, which we consider incorrect because world history knows of no country with colonial status where free, multiparty elections were held and then that country still remained a colony after those elections.

Colonial self-management is always prescribed by the center of empire, never chosen by the people. The election of a national power in Georgia put an end to Georgia's status as a colony. Georgia is no longer a colony, but it is not yet an independent country. And we elected a national power in order to start to eliminate the consequences of annexation and to restore independent statehood. Recognition of Georgia as an occupied country, ascribing to Soviet troops the status of an army of a foreign country, and raising at the level of international law the question of the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Georgia, for which it will be necessary to initiate talks with the center and the western countries, is another matter. Thus, it is our opinion that Georgia is an annexed country in which the process of eliminating the consequences of annexation and restoring independent statehood has begun. And the first step on that road is to replace the regime imposed by the center with a new, elected popular power. At the same time we must once again clearly state our position with respect to the new Union treaty. We are against it for the simple reason that during the transitional period Georgia is still not an independent, sovereign state and a subject of international law.

One feature of the newly elected multiparty legislature of Georgia that distinguishes it from the so-called Supreme Soviet appointed by the center during the Soviet period will be that the new legislature will be in permanent session through its standing commissions. It will not exist just in a nominal way; it will have to find solutions for very complex political and socioeconomic problems, and as a result deputies cannot be engaged simultaneously in other duties; this means that there will be a real delineation of legislative and executive powers.

The main goal of the legislative commissions will be to make ready the legislative bases for reforms during the transitional period.

As noted in our programs, the main thrust of the political reforms during the transitional period will be to dismantle the bureaucratic apparatus and existing Soviet imperial structures, and to form new democratic structures, abolish the administrative command system, and affirm the principle of electivity for the management structures of executive power and in all spheres of sociopolitical, economic, and cultural life. From this standpoint, the municipal elections for the local soviets, which must also be held on the democratic principle, and as a result of which the local organs of power will themselves be the defenders of the civic, political, and social rights of the population, will be an important event.

Since we are fighting to defend human rights and to form a state governed by the rule of law, our state system should rest on the generally recognized standards of international law, the UN Declaration on Human Rights, and the Helsinki and Vienna international agreements, so that effective steps can be taken within the republic to affirm citizens' legal guarantees. It is no secret that during the Soviet period the rights of the indigenous Georgian population were grossly violated in Georgia, and its interests infringed upon. Discrimination, oppression, and persecution reached a culmination particularly in those regions where communist totalitarianism established an ethnocracy by the non-Georgian population. Systematic victimization of the Georgian language and making it illegal in most institutions even within the Georgian capital, Tbilisi, itself, created unbearable conditions for the Georgia cadres, while the dominance of the Russian language and its de facto transformation into the official language resulted, and is still partly resulting, in discrimination against Georgians, a privileged position for non-Georgians, and the selection and disposition of cadres according to the level of knowledge of Russian, which is a gross violation of even the existing constitution. During the Soviet period, Georgia was officially declared a unique laboratory for the merging and diffusion of nations, and this had but one aim, namely, assimilation of the Georgian people by means of accelerated demographic expansion by neighboring peoples. To this same end, the bureaucratic apparatus closed its eyes to the corruption and in a certain sense even stimulated it, and the result was that in recent years in some regions of Georgia thousands of hectares of the best farmland have been handed over to the non-Georgian population while, as a rule, Georgian families were refused even a small tract of land, and in some local organs are still being refused to this day. Since the UN Charter and the Helsinki and Vienna agreements are based on the principles of equality, this oppression of and discrimination against the Georgian people on their own land and the privileged position of other nations must be considered a violation of all generally accepted standards of international law, and an international crime.

Therefore, the Georgian legislature should set itself the main task of providing legal guarantees for the Georgian

population in Georgia, and real, not hollow realization of the official status of the Georgian language, and a switch to Georgian as the business language at all enterprises and establishments, and those enterprises that are unable to use the Georgian language because of their Union subordination should be removed from that subordination or simply cease to exist. In parallel with the legitimization of the Georgian people, it is necessary to accelerate the introduction of Georgian citizenship and to draw up a law that will put an end to the uncontrolled immigration and demographic expansion of foreign nations into Georgia. But at the same time we are not ignoring the rights of national minorities that are living legally on our land and helping the Georgian people in their struggle for freedom and independence. In this connection we intend to preserve the autonomy of the national minorities in Georgia, naturally on a firm constitutional and legal basis, while giving due consideration to the constitutional rights of the Georgian people; the question of the autonomy of Adzharia must be decided by referendum.

My dear friends, our future successes in the political sphere will depend largely on improvement in the economy and the economic reforms that we have set as a goal; for this it is necessary to have a realistic picture of Georgia's socioeconomic development—a picture that shows that the country is standing on the threshold of obvious economic crisis. To judge from central planning, the economy is increasingly showing its inability to deal with Georgia's vital economic interests. For years we have observed a shortage of essential goods and of food products and fuel. This all becomes obvious when we look at the numeric indicators. For example, according to the statistics, the volume of goods in the retail trade organizations in the Republic was 1,426 million rubles [R] on 1 October 1990, instead of the R1,478 million during the corresponding period last year—a decline of 3.6 percent. In the Republic Ministry of Trade retail network reserve stocks stand at R500 million, against R533 million on 1 October 1989. During this period, the Republic has had reserve stocks for 84 days, which is 16 days less than the corresponding period last year. Reserve stocks for 56 days were available in the Ministry of Trade retail network, 14 days less. Reserves of the most important livestock farming products have obviously decreased in wholesale trade and industry. For example, whereas in 1989 reserve stocks of butter stood at 8,900 tons, this year they have declined to 3.6 tons [as published]. The corresponding figures for reserve stocks of eggs have fallen from 48.7 million to 26.3 million, and for sugar from 15,700 tons to 14,000 tons; and so forth.

For example, production of basic foodstuffs by enterprises in the agro-industrial complex during the period January through October 1990, is characterized by the following indicators: meat production fell 19,000 tons compared with last year; sausage production by 7,000 tons; butter by 320,000 tons; cheese by 5,000 tons; and the same is seen in other spheres of food production. At the same time, as of 1 November, reserves of tobacco in industry and in wholesale trade decreased 75.6 percent, or R2.6 million. A similar picture is seen with deliveries of goods from light industry into the state and cooperative trade stocks. Compared with the corresponding period, last year the total volume of agricultural produce sold at collective farm [kolkhoz] markets in Tbilisi, Kutaisi, Batumi, and Sukhumi fell 9.2 percent, while average prices rose 25.6 percent. The public had to spend R69 million more to acquire these same products than it would have had to spend during the January through October period of last year. Plans are not being fulfilled in all spheres of consumer goods production, and industrial enterprises are failing to meet their annual obligations. The lagging is being seen particularly in the republic council for tourism and excursions, the Ministry of Culture, the former Ministry of Automotive Transport and Highways, the Ministry of Communications, the republic council on trade union resort management, the bureau of international youth tourism, the Ministry of Public Health, the "Gruzavtomotoservis" Production Association, the Georgia Union of Consumer Cooperatives, and the "Dinamo" republic sports council.

The situation has become serious in housing and sociocultural construction. Compared with the corresponding period last year, the total area of housing handed over for use through state funds has fallen by 166,000 square meters, or 33.4 percent. The annual plan for this indicator has been fulfilled only 31.4 percent. The situation is the same with respect to the construction of schools, preschool establishments, hospitals, outpatient departments, polyclinics, and vocational and technical schools.

The financial crisis continues. Meeting obligations to mobilize financial resources from the state budget is still difficult, mainly as the result of failure to make payments into the budget from profits (incomes) by enterprises and organizations. During this period there has been a shortfall of R41.4 million, or 7.7 percent, in the form of payments from profits into the Georgian state budget. Some 300 enterprises and organizations have failed to meet their annual profit targets, and 57 enterprises and organizations ended the period January through September this year with losses. Still lagging is the activity of the construction complex, and realization of annual programs for commissioning production capacities, and construction projects are threatened with failure. Plan fulfillment is below the republic average at "Gruzneft" (42.3 percent), "Gruzugol" (64.4 percent), "Gruzagrostroy" (77.1 percent), and other production associations. In addition, we are providing a great deal of assistance to other republics, while our own situation is extraordinarily difficult.

We must study present-day foreign economic activity from many standpoints. Today, export deliveries are being made by 66 enterprises and organizations of Union, Union-republic, and republic subordination. They have exported goods worth R140.7 million. Control is needed to insure that the activity of such enterprises invariably be in the interests of the national

economy and not harm overall economic strategy. During the period of gradual transition to the principle of the market economy, it will be necessary to establish firm control over exports of our strategic raw materials and output. Of course, the unattractive picture of our economy is the result first and foremost of the inefficiency of the socialist economic system. The principle of centralized planning in this situation is the main preventive factor, but it also promotes the colonial pillaging of Georgia and subordinates our economy to the diktat of the economic system of planning from the center. The corruption, lack of control, speculation, and mismanagement resulting from the decay of the structures of power and from irresponsibility are significant destructive factors.

In our opinion there is only one solution to the crisis situation that has been created: dismantling the socialist economic system based on administrative command methods and central planning and gradually switch to a free market economy. Our programs note that the fundamental principle of a market economy is regulating the market forces of demand and supply. Intervention and regulation by the government while practical decisions are made differ radically from administrative command regulation in a socialist system. Here, intervention in the activity of the private sector or regulation of it takes place mainly in the interests of the consumer. Private ownership of the means of production, private financial markets, and a free labor market are the basis ingredients of a market economy. After these elements have been introduced, with the help of their elected representatives, the people will decide the form of market economic relations with the civilized countries of the world. Resources must be allocated by market forces, not by a bureaucracy. State control over distribution, like price controls, should not be based on the outdated administrative method. Moreover, there is a great danger of so-called "market socialism." A market economy should rely directly on the private sector and free international trade. Here it is necessary to accelerate the process of privatization, particularly in the countryside. It is necessary to pass a law on land that will necessarily entail the introduction of the status of citizen of Georgia. On the basis of this law on citizens of Georgia, land should be transferred to private ownership without right of alienation, which will undoubtedly promote a strengthening of the population in rural localities and the development of peasant farming in Georgia. It is also necessary to restore traditional forms of agriculture.

We offer this warning to everyone: Even though we have announced national consensus and tolerance, and have stated that we shall ask no one to account for former transgressions, anyone who henceforth sets himself against today's process of renewal and exacerbates an already tense situation by corruption, speculation, or sabotage will answer to the people and to the law.

In this connection it should also be stated that the catastrophic increase in crime to which the alarming statistics point is causing very great outrage among the public. Thus, for example, during the period January through October a total of 15,839 crimes were registered in Georgia, 12.5 percent more than during the corresponding period last year, while the number of serious crimes grew 15 percent and included 209 murders, or 21 percent more, and the number of robberies and thefts increased by a factor of 1.9 and 2.0 respectively. It should be noted that we consider crime a social problem since it is born out of the ugly sociopolitical system under which we lived for so many years. The destruction of religion, the decline in morals, and the contempt for spiritual ideals are the real sources of crime. Civilized mankind knows only one way to liquidate crime and affirm social harmony, and that is the revitalization of religion, the correct education of young people, and the affirmation of moral ideals in society. But, at the same time, we are forced to fight specific manifestations of crime, particularly crimes again the lives and health of individuals. Giving due consideration to the great social danger in the situation that has been created, we have decided to promulgate a law on the maintenance and strengthening of law and order and a resolution on the creation of a national domestic army. This should insure stability during the transitional period. Here, the removal of party influence from law enforcement agencies, which has already been started in the Procurator's Office of the Georgian Republic, must necessarily be complete. This can only be welcomed. We welcome the extraordinary behavior of the Catholicos-Patriarch of All Georgia Iliya II, who has censured murder as the most heinous crime against the nation, and we believe that any Georgian who raises his hand against his fellow deserves anathema and should become an outcast of the nation.

My dear friends, under the conditions of the totalitarian regime and communist ideological diktat, a danger was created not only to the sociopolitical and economic existence of the Georgian nation, but first and foremost to its spiritual and cultural values. The monuments unique to the Georgian culture are in catastrophic condition—Alaverdi, Mravaldzali, Alvanskaya Tskhrakara, Nikortsminda, Zarzma, and many others. Our descendants will never forgive our heartlessness to them. A start has been made in museum affairs and concern is needed from the arts sectors. Today what is needed is radical reform of existing structures to safeguard the cultural heritage, and we must clarify questions pertaining to competence, status, and the material base of the Ministry of Culture, the Department for the Preservation of Monuments, and individual persons and departments that hold historical and cultural monuments. At the same time, it is necessary to set up an independent state inspection service to safeguard the cultural heritage, and to define the status and improve the material base of leading state cultural institutions. This applies in particular to the Georgian State Museum, the Museum of Arts, and the Theater of Opera and Ballet. We must certainly also review questions pertaining to subsidies for the regional theaters and museums of local lore, history, and economy and memorial museums, and we must review and improve the training programs of the Academy of

the Arts, the Conservatory, and the Theater Institute, and strengthen their material base. It is necessary to review the question of the status of the Academy of Sciences, and to carry out a radical reform of the centralized bureaucratic system for the management of science. We must establish cultural contacts in a new way with foreign countries, and Georgia must certainly be a member of and involved in international organizations devoted to the preservation of monuments, museum affairs, and so forth, so that the world public will be more familiar with our cultural heritage. This will also insure better preservation.

Radical reform in the educational system is urgent. We must review study programs on a priority basis, and it is essential to eliminate the totally useless and superfluous disciplines—the so-called history of the CPSU, Marxism-Leninism, socialist political economy, so-called sociology, dialectical and historical materialism, and others. We must restore proper teaching of the history and geography of Georgia, expand the teaching of religion, set up Sunday parish church schools and faculties of theology in colleges, and deepen and improve studies of Georgian language and literature, and within Georgia priority must be given to Georgian schools and the number of Russian schools cut in accordance with the requirements only of the Russian-speaking population. Georgian children should not be educated in Russian schools.

My dear friends, our just struggle for freedom and independence is the focus of world attention. Let everyone know that we have fought and are fighting for a revival of the religious and national ideals of our forefathers because the Almighty has given Georgia a great mission. The Georgian people have endured unprecedented torments as they marched along the thorny road of history, and have always been the preachers of morality and justice and have sacrificed the flesh for the soul, and have set as their highest goal service of the truth, for which they have been repeatedly subjected to persecution and torture by barbarians and heathens. But they have come through the Calvary of history to the hour of their resurrection and rebirth, to their state of radiance before the peoples of the earth, to the hour when, through God, mankind will recognize blessed, radiant Georgia. The day is not far off when Georgia will become as example of moral greatness for the entire world.

My dear friends, our movement is first and foremost a religious movement, for without religion there is no true national rebirth. And so, today our nation and our church are together. We are fighting against the eternal night of godlessness, and the Almighty will protect our just cause, and so we will win. The Georgian people will not go along the road of godlessness, brigandage, and terror. The road for the Georgian people is the road of charity, the road of courage, the road of love, the road of Christ, henceforth and forever, through all the centuries.

Blessed be Georgia, realm of the Mother of God!
God be with you! Amen!

Session Resumes Work 22 Nov

91US0148A Tbilisi ZARYA VOSTOKA in Russian 23 Nov 90 p 1

[Sakartvelo Information Agency report: "First Session of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia"]

[Text] The first session of the first convocation of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia resumed its work on 22 November. It was opened by Zviad Gamsakhurdia, chairman of the Supreme Soviet. After approving the agenda, the deputies commenced consideration of its issues.

The first question on the session's agenda was approval of the composition of the permanent commissions of the Republic's legislature. Proposals on this question were presented by the chairmen of the commissions: legislation and the preservation of legality—Nugzar Molodinashvili; finance-budget—Tariel Gelantiya; economic reform—Givi Taktakishvili; humanitarian and social questions—Robert Petriashvili; industry, energy, construction, transportation, and communications—Bakur Gulula; agriculture, land utilization, and ecology—Irakliy Chkheidze; deputy chairman of the international relations commission—Merab Uridiya; culture, education and science—Teymuraz Koridze; and defense, national security, and law and order—Vazha Alamiya.

After an exchange of opinions on the questions under consideration, the session approved the composition of these commissions.

Afterwards, the floor was given to Tengiz Sigua, the chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Republic of Georgia. He presented a number of proposals on the formation of a new cabinet of ministers of the Republic and the implementation of a reorganization of the structure of some ministries and departments, and he named candidates for ministry posts. After this, review of the candidacies was transferred to the permanent commissions, insomuch as, according to the law in effect, the session of the Supreme Soviet can have opinions regarding proposals of the head of the government of the republic until they are preliminarily considered in these commissions, which happened during the recess.

After the recess, having adopted a decree on the replacement of official holidays and Georgian Independence Day—26 May—in effect up until now, and also the restoration of traditional Christian holidays, the legislature continued consideration of candidacies for ministerial posts. On recommendation of the permanent commissions, the session appointed: Dzhoni Khetsuriani—minister of justice; Liya Andguladze—minister of education; Nodar Tsuleyskiri—minister of culture; Teymuraz Kvantaliani—chairman of the State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting; Irakliy Zhordani—minister of science, technology, and long-term

planning; Felix Tkebuchava—minister of communication; Tamaz Gvelesiani—minister of trade; Guram Absandze—minister of finances; Dilar Khabuliani—minister of internal affairs; Georgiy Khoshtaria—minister of foreign affairs; Aleksandr Chkheidze—minister of transport; and Irakliy Menagarishvili—minister of health and social security.

The session ratified additional amendments to the Constitution of the Republic of Georgia. Afterwards, the deputies considered the draft decree on decisions adopted by the people's deputies of the South Ossetia Autonomous Oblast regarding a change in the status of the oblast. The Supreme Soviet of Georgia revoked all acts adopted by the recently proclaimed so-called "Soviet Democratic Republic of South Ossetia," because it contradicts the existing Constitution of the Republic of Georgia and also the provisions of the USSR Constitution and the decree of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of 21 September 1990, of the then still Georgian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic]. At the same time, the former decision of the Georgian Supreme Soviet is confirmed regarding the fact that in the future the rights of national minorities living in the republic will be protected, just as this is guaranteed by the principles of international law. After making amendments and refinements, the session adopted the decree.

The deputies listened to information of Akakiy Asatiani, first deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Georgian Republic, concerning participation of the delegation of our republic in the work of the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, which they took under consideration.

The legislature adopted a statement regarding the conception of the new Union treaty, which was received recently at the Supreme Soviet of the Republic. The Supreme Soviet of Georgia unanimously adopted a law on the declaration in the republic of a transitional period on the way to the restoration of its full state independence and sovereignty, of which it was deprived in February 1921, as a result of armed aggression on the part of the government of the then Soviet Russia. Under conditions where the political, economic, and legal structures in effect in the Soviet Union imply excessive dependence on the center and deprive the republic of the attributes of a real sovereign state, the legislature of Georgia believes that the signing of a new Union treaty and the assumption of any kind of obligations are not possible. Subsequently, the deputies approved the composition of the commission for the preparation of a draft new constitution of the Republic of Georgia.

As is known, a decree on the suspension of the action of the USSR Law on Universal Military Service on Georgian territory was adopted at the previous meeting of the session. This time, the legislature ratified appropriate changes in the Republic's Criminal Code, which revoke the previously stipulated criminal answerability for evading service in the ranks of the Soviet Army.

The Supreme Soviet formed a commission on the study of the evolving situation in the Tbilisi Medical Institute and determination of the fate of the participants in the attempted hijacking of an aircraft on 18 November 1983. Incidentally, this commission was established at the request of Deputy Viktor Domukhovskiy, made at a meeting of the session of 14 November.

The deputies discussed and ratified a Law on Amnesty.

Zviad Gamsakhurdia, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Georgian Republic, made a statement before the participants at the conclusion of the session. In particular, he noted that the events that took place in Georgia recently constitute a peaceful revolution. There are forces, however, that in their irresponsible actions are creating recurrences of destabilization of the situation in our republic and are thereby assisting those circles in the center who are trying with all their power to turn us back. Everyone should realize this and do his bit in forming Georgia's tomorrow. We no longer have a Soviet militia here, a national militia is being established, and the one who comes out against it is coming out against the Georgian people. The session ended its work on this note.

Law on Transitional Period

91US0142A Tbilisi ZARYA VOSTOKA in Russian 15 Nov 90 pp 1, 3

["Law of the Republic of Georgia on the Announcement of a Transitional Period in the Republic of Georgia"—ZARYA VOSTOKA headline]

[Text] In announcing a transitional period, during which the foundations must be laid for the restoration of the state independence of Georgia, the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia resolves as follows:

I.1. To formulate the preamble as follows:

Georgia's statehood, which has its origins back in the distant centuries, was lost to it early in the 19th century as the result of intervention by a foreign force.

The Georgian people have never reconciled themselves to their loss of statehood.

In 1917 the Russian Empire was overthrown, which gave the Georgian people the opportunity to proclaim, through the 26 May 1918 Act of Independence, the restoration of their statehood and to remove the Russian autocracy established more than a century before.

The Georgian people exercised their will on 12 March 1919 when, at the first session of the constituent assembly, they recognized and confirmed to the country and to history the act of independence adopted earlier, and then on 21 February 1921 adopted the constitution of Georgia.

In February and March 1921, grossly violating the Peace Treaty of 7 May 1920, Soviet Russia through occupied Georgia armed aggression; later it became virtual annexation.

The entire period during which Georgia was part of the Soviet Union was marked by bloody terror and repressions (particularly in 1924, 1936-1938, 1949-1951, and 1956), and the latest manifestation was the tragedy of 9 April 1989. That event raised the national liberation movement in Georgia to a qualitatively new level.

One of the most important stages in the national liberation movement was on 28 October 1990, when national forces won in multiparty democratic elections to the Georgian Supreme Soviet. Thus started a turning-point period that must culminate in the restoration of full state independence for Georgia.

Before drawing up a new constitution, Georgia's existing constitution will, with appropriate changes and amendments, remain in force in accordance with the requirements of the transitional period, as the interim Fundamental Law of the Republic of Georgia.

The transitional period is a very important stage for the national liberation movement, and during this period real foundations will be built for the restoration of Georgia's full state independence.

2. To replace the words "Georgian Soviet Socialist Republic" and "Georgian SSR" in the text of the constitution with the words "Republic of Georgia."

3. To delete the word "socialist" from the title of Chapter 4 and from Articles 1, 4, 60, and 64, and to replace it with the word "state" in Articles 37, 48, and 59.

4. To delete the word "Soviet" from Articles 4, 35, 37, and 60.

5. To delete the words "USSR Constitution" from Articles 4, 35, 37, and 57.

6. a) To delete the words "Communist Party, other..." from Article 6.

b) To delete the words "serve the communist indoctrination of youth..." from Article 25.

c) To delete the words "revolutionary and..." from Article 36.

d) To delete the words "in accordance with the aims of the building of communist...." from Article 45.

e) To delete the words "respect the rules of socialist communal living and to bear with dignity the high title of Soviet citizen" from Article 57.

f) To delete the words "Soviet multinational state..." from Article 62.

7. a) To make the title of Chapter 7 of the constitution read as follows: "The Position of the Republic of Georgia in the USSR."

b) To make Article 68 read as follows:

"The Republic of Georgia is the heir of the sovereign Democratic Republic of Georgia. It was forcibly made a part of the Soviet Union. Proceeding from this reality, the Republic of Georgia is forced during the transitional period to secure for the Soviet Union in the highest organs of its state power and administration the rights as defined in Article 73 of the USSR Constitution except the areas of competence as defined in clauses 3, 4, and 11 of that article.

"Outside the limits set forth above the Republic of Georgia will exercise independent state power over its own territory."

c) To make Article 77 read as follows:

"The laws of the Republic of Georgia and the laws of the USSR will be in force on the territory of the Republic of Georgia, and the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia will suspend the force of laws and legal enactments of the Soviet Union on the territory of the Republic of Georgia if they are at variance with the laws and interests of the Republic of Georgia."

d) To make Article 180 read as follows:

"The state emblem of the Republic of Georgia is an ornamented star with seven points; the gold ornamentation is surrounded by a black border. The space between the borders is cherry red.

"A circular Georgian shield on a cherry red field, depicting Tetri Giorgi on a white charger with golden hooves, is set in the center of the star. In his right hand Tetri Giorgi holds a silver-tipped golden spear readied for combat and in his left a shield with a gold stripe.

"Tetri Giorgi is appareled in crimson pantaloons and golden boots. He is wearing blue armor with a silver breast plate and a white cloak. A brown shirt can be seen beneath the breast plate.

"A tiger skin is placed beneath the saddle of Tetri Giorgi's charger, and the saddle is golden and the bridle silver.

"An eight-pointed silver star shines above Tetri Giorgi's head. To the right of the star is a silver Moon, and to the left a golden Sun. Two eight-pointed stars are placed about both the Moon and the Sun.

"A mountain top is depicted beneath the charger."

e) To make Article 181 read as follows:

"The state and national flag of Georgia is a rectangle of red cloth with a black band extending from the flagpole side (upward) and a white band (downward).

"The ratio of the width of the flag to its length is 3:5, and the width of each band (black and white) is equal to one-fifth of the flag while the length is two-fifths of the length of the flag;"

f) To make Article 182 read as follows:

"The state anthem of the Republic of Georgia is confirmed by the Georgian Supreme Soviet."

8. To delete from the constitution Articles 3, 9, 14, 15, 16, 20, 23, 29, 30, and 61 in their entirety, and also the second parts of Articles 8 and 34 and the second clause of Article 58.

9. To make Article 28 of the constitution of the Republic of Georgia read as follows:
"Article 28.
"In its foreign policy activity the Republic of Georgia is guided by the principles of international law and the laws of the Republic of Georgia.
"The propaganda of war is banned in the Republic of Georgia."

II. This Law enters into force from the moment that it is passed.

[Signed] Z. GAMZAKHURDIA, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia.
[Dated] Tbilisi, 14 November 1990.

Decrees Published

91US0137B Tbilisi ZARYA VOSTOKA in Russian 16 Nov 90 pp 1-2

["Decrees of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia"—ZARYA VOSTOKA headline]

[Text]

DECREE OF THE SUPREME SOVIET OF THE REPUBLIC OF GEORGIA on appointing the chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Republic of Georgia

The Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia decrees:

1. To appoint as chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Republic of Georgia Tengiz Ippolitovich Sigua.
2. To instruct the chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Republic of Georgia to submit to the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia suggestions concerning the structure and personnel composition of the Council of Ministers of the Republic of Georgia.
3. The corresponding permanent commissions of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia are to submit to the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia conclusions concerning the structure and personnel composition of the government of the Republic of Georgia.

[Signed] Chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia, Z. Gamsakhurdia
[Dated] Tbilisi. 15 November 1990.

DECREE OF THE SUPREME SOVIET OF THE REPUBLIC OF GEORGIA on Election of the First Deputy Chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia

The Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia decrees:

To elect as first deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia Deputy Akakiy Tornikovich Asatiani.

[Signed] Chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia, Z. Gamsakhurdia
[Dated] Tbilisi. 15 November 1990.

DECREE OF THE SUPREME SOVIET OF THE REPUBLIC OF GEORGIA on the Election of the Deputy Chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia

The Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia decrees:

To elect as deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia Deputy Nemo Pyerovich Burchuladze.

[Signed] Chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia, Z. Gamsakhurdia
[Dated] Tbilisi. 15 November 1990.

DECREE OF THE SUPREME SOVIET OF THE REPUBLIC OF GEORGIA on the Formation of Permanent Commissions of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia

The Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia decrees:

To form the following permanent commissions of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia:

—a commission for legislation and upholding the law;
—a finance and budget commission;
—a commission for economic reform;
—a commission for humanitarian and social issues;
—a commission for industry, energy, construction, transportation, and communications;
—a commission for agriculture, land use, and ecology;
—a commission for international relations;
—a commission for defense, national security, and law and order;
—a commission for culture, education, and science.

[Signed] Chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia, Z. Gamsakhurdia
[Dated] Tbilisi. 15 November 1990.

DECREE OF THE SUPREME SOVIET OF THE REPUBLIC OF GEORGIA on the Election of Chairmen of Permanent Commissions of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia

The Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia decrees:

To elect as chairmen of the permanent commissions of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia the following deputies:

Of the commission for legislation and upholding the law—Nugzar Archilovich Meledinashvili.
Of the commission on finance and budget—Tariyel Amiranovich Gelantiy.
Of the commission for economic reform—Givi Chitoyevich Taktakishvili.
Of the commission for humanitarian and social problems—Robert Melentyevich Petriashvili.
Of the commission for industry, energy, construction, transportation, and communications—Bakur Davidovich Gulua.
Of the commission for agriculture, land use, and ecology—Irakliy Otarovich Chkhendze.

Of the commission for international relations—Tedo Salvovich Paatashvili.
Of the commission for defense, national security, and law and order—Vazh Georgiyevich Adamiy.
Of the commission for culture, education, and science—Teymuraz Akakiyevich Koridze.

[Signed] Chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia, Z. Gamsakhurdia
[Dated]Tbilisi. 15 November 1990.

DECREE OF THE SUPREME SOVIET OF THE REPUBLIC OF GEORGIA on Protection of Human Rights and Strengthening Law and Order

Crime in the Republic of Georgia has assumed an alarming character. There has been a sharp increase in the number of murders, muggings, thefts, and other crimes against individuals, including cases of organized crime. There are gross disturbances of public order, an atmosphere of lawlessness has been created, and state discipline has collapsed. Under the conditions of the existing economic difficulties, in a situation without control and without punishment, cases of abuse of official positions for selfish purposes have become more frequent.

All this creates a serious threat to generally recognized human rights and civic peace. Such a moral and legal situation in the republic is even less tolerable since an urgent task on the agenda is the restoration of Georgia's state independence and the formation of a democratic rule-of-law state.

There are serious problems in the activity of law enforcement organs, which are brought about to a certain degree by the imperfections of the organs themselves and their subordination to the dictates of the party.

In order to adopt resolute measures against crime, protect human rights, and strengthen law and order, the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia decrees:

1. Under conditions of political pluralism, to consider it expedient to allow recognized party organizations to be formed and to function in organs of the court, arbitration, the procuracy, internal affairs, and state security of the republic. Moreover, the officials elected or appointed to these organs may not be members of any political party at the same time.
2. Republic law enforcement organs are to take all measures envisioned by the law to stop crime, strengthen law and order, and protect the rights of the citizens.
3. Special subdivisions of internal forces for strengthening law and order and fighting are to be formed under the Georgian Ministry of Internal Affairs. They are to be staffed mainly with citizens who are subject to being called up for compulsory military service.
4. The newly formed Georgian Council of Ministers is to solve problems of organizational, material, and financial support for the special subdivisions for strengthening law and order and fighting crime.
5. The corresponding commissions of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia are to prepare and submit to the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia:
a) proposals for reform of the system of law enforcement organs of the republic;
b) proposals for making changes and additions to existing legislation and also adopting an amnesty act;
c) a draft law on the legal status of special subdivisions for strengthening law and order and fighting crime.

[Signed] Chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia, Z. Gamsakhurdia
[Dated] Tbilisi. 15 November 1990.

LAW OF THE REPUBLIC OF GEORGIA on the Effects of the USSR Law on Compulsory Military Service on the Territory of the Republic of Georgia

The Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia decrees:

To nullify on the territory of the Republic of Georgia the USSR Law on Compulsory Military Service, so that youth living in Georgia are not drafted into the Soviet Army.

[Signed] Chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia, Z. Gamsakhurdia
[Dated] Tbilisi. 15 November 1990.

Legislature Declares Amnesty

91US0147B Tbilisi ZARYA VOSTOKA in Russian 23 Nov 90 p 1

["Law of the Republic of Georgia on Amnesty"—ZARYA VOSTOKA headline]

[Text] Celebrating the victory of the national movement in the multiparty democratic elections and the beginning of the transition period of the restoration of the state independence of Georgia, and based on the principles of humanism, the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia decrees: 1. To release from punishment in the form of incarceration, regardless of the length of the sentence, and also punishment not involving incarceration pronounced by the courts of the Georgian Soviet Socialist Republic:

a) women;
b) men over 60 years of age;
c) disabled persons of groups I and II.

2. To release from punishment individuals sentenced to incarceration for a period of up to five years inclusively who have no previously served time in corrective labor institutions, and also those with sentences not involving incarceration.

3. To release from serving further time convicts who have actually served half of their sentence and have not previously spent any time in corrective labor institutions.

4. To release from punishment in the form of incarceration minors who have not previously spent any time in corrective labor institutions.

5. To release from punishment individuals convicted of crimes committed because of carelessness and sentenced to incarceration for periods of up to eight years inclusively.

6. To reduce by half the sentences for individuals convicted of crimes committed because of carelessness and sentenced to incarceration for a period of more than eight years.

7. To halt all investigations and cases not examined by the courts for crimes committed by individuals listed in Article 1 of the present law before it went into force.

8. Individuals listed in Articles 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the present law not to be released from punishment:

a) convicted for: violation of ethnic and racial rights (under Article 75); banditry (under Article 78 of the Criminal Code [UK]); manufacture and sale of counterfeit money or securities (under Article 88 of the UK); premeditated murder (under Articles 104 and 105 of the UK); premeditated serious bodily harm (under Article 110 of the UK); attempt on the life of a worker of the militia or public patrol maintaining public order (under Article 209.1 of the UK); rape (under parts III and IV of Article 117 of the UK); theft of state or public property on an especially large scale through stealing, robbery, and banditry (under Article 96.1 of the UK); theft of state or public property and also private property of citizens with extenuating circumstances (under parts III and IV of Article 91 and parts III and IV of Article 150 of the UK); theft under extenuating circumstances (under parts II, III, and IV of Article 92 and parts II, III, and IV of Article 151 of the UK); banditry (under Article 96 and 152 of the UK); especially malicious hooliganism (under part III of Article 228 of the UK); theft of fire arms, ammunition, or explosive substances (under Article 240 of the UK); driving away means of transportation under extenuating circumstances (under part II of Article 243); illegal manufacture, acquisition, storage, shipment, sending, or sale of narcotics (under parts I, II, III, IV, and V of Article 252 of the UK); inclination to take drugs (under Article 252.3 of the UK); organization and maintenance of premises for the consumption of drugs or granting premises for these purposes (under Article 252.6 of the UK); planting or cultivating opium poppies and marijuana, which are prohibited (under Article 253 of the UK);

b) individuals declared to be especially dangerous recidivists;

c) individuals convicted three or more times and sentenced to incarceration for premeditated crimes and also those previously convicted for crimes indicated in point "a" of Article 8 of the present law;

d) individuals who have been drunk and violated driving rules (under parts III and IV of Article 241 of the UK).

9. To reduce the remaining amount of time of punishment for the following individuals not subject to release under the present law:

a) those conditionally released from places of incarceration with mandatory labor—by half;

b) convicts who have served time in corrective labor institutions and served no less than one-third of the period of the assigned term, who have been sentenced to incarceration two or more times—by half.

10. The sentence is not removed from individuals released from punishment under the present law and they are not released from additional punishment (with the exception of exile and resettlement).

11. The present law goes into effect from the time it is adopted and is subject to execution for six months.

[Signed] Chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia Z. Gamsakhurdia
[Dated] Tbilisi, 22 November 1990

Three New Ministries Decreed

91US0147A Tbilisi ZARYA VOSTOKA in Russian 23 Nov 90 p 1

[Decrees on forming three ministries in the Georgian Soviet Socialist Republic]

[Text]

LAW OF THE REPUBLIC OF GEORGIA ON THE FORMATION OF THE MINISTRY OF SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY, AND LONG-RANGE PLANNING OF THE REPUBLIC OF GEORGIA

The Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia decrees:

To form the Ministry of Science, Technology, and Long-Range Planning of the Republic of Georgia.

To make additions to the Law on the Council of Ministers of the Republic of Georgia.

In Article 26 of the aforementioned law after the words "Ministry of Local Industry" to add the words: "Ministry of Science, Technology, and Long-Range Planning of the Republic of Georgia."

[Signed] **Chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia Z. Gamsakhurdia**
[Dated] Tbilisi, 22 November 1990

LAW OF THE REPUBLIC OF GEORGIA ON THE FORMATION OF THE MINISTRY OF TRANSPORTATION OF THE REPUBLIC OF GEORGIA

The Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia decrees:

To form the Ministry of Transportation of the Republic of Georgia.

To replace the words in Article 26 of the aforementioned law: "Ministry of Automotive Transportation and Roads of the Georgian Soviet Socialist Republic" with the words: "Ministry of Transportation of the Republic of Georgia."

[Signed] **Chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia Z. Gamsakhurdia**
[Dated] Tbilisi, 22 November 1990

LAW OF THE REPUBLIC OF GEORGIA ON THE UNIFICATION OF THE MINISTRY OF PUBLIC HEALTH AND THE MINISTRY OF SOCIAL SECURITY OF THE REPUBLIC OF GEORGIA

The Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia decrees:

To unify the Ministry of Public Health and the Ministry of Social Security of the Republic of Georgia and to name it the Ministry of Public Health and Social Security of the Republic of Georgia.

To make changes and additions to the Law on the Council of Ministers of the Republic of Georgia.

From Article 25 of the aforementioned law to eliminate the words: "Ministry of Public Health of the Georgian Soviet Socialist Republic";

In Article 26 to replace the words "Ministry of Public Health of the Georgian Soviet Socialist Republic" with the words: "Ministry of Public Health and Social Security of the Republic of Georgia."

[Signed]**Chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia Z. Gamsakhurdia**
[Dated] Tbilisi, 22 November 1990

New Ministers Appointed

91US0147C Tbilisi ZARYA VOSTOKA in Russian 23 Nov 90 pp 1-2

[Decrees of the Georgian Republic Supreme Soviet]

[Text]

DECREE OF THE SUPREME SOVIET OF THE REPUBLIC OF GEORGIA

On the Appointment of D.G. Khetsuriani as Minister of Justice of the Republic of Georgia:

The Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia decrees:

To appoint Khetsuriani Dzhoni Grigoryevic as minister of justice of the Republic of Georgia.

[Signed] **Chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia Z. Gamsakhurdia**
[Dated] Tbilisi, 22 November 1990

DECREE OF THE SUPREME SOVIET OF THE REPUBLIC OF GEORGIA

On the Appointment of L.N. Andguladze as Minister of Education of the Republic of Georgia

The Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia decrees:

To appoint Andguladze Liya Nikolayevna as minister of education of the Republic of Georgia.

[Signed] **Chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia Z. Gamsakhurdia**
[Dated] Tbilisi, 22 November 1990

DECREE OF THE SUPREME SOVIET OF THE REPUBLIC OF GEORGIA

On the Appointment of N.A. Tsuleyskiri as Minister of Culture of the Republic of Georgia

The Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia decrees:

To appoint Tsuleyskiri Nodar Aleksandrovich as minister of culture of the Republic of Georgia.

[Signed][begin bold] Chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia Z. Gamsakhurdia[end bold]
[Dated] Tbilisi, 22 November 1990

DECREE OF THE SUPREME SOVIET OF THE REPUBLIC OF GEORGIA

On the Appointment of T.Sh. Kvantaliani as Chairman of the State Committee of the Republic of Georgia for Television and Radio Broadcasting.

The Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia decrees:

To appoint Kvantaliani Teymuraz Shotayevich as chairman of the State Committee of the Republic of Georgia for Television and Radio Broadcasting.

[Signed] **Chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia Z. Gamsakhurdia**
[Dated] Tbilisi, 22 November 1990

DECREE OF THE SUPREME SOVIET OF THE REPUBLIC OF GEORGIA

On the appointment of I.S. Zhordaniy as Minister of Science, Technology, and Long-Range Planning of the Republic of Georgia

The Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia decrees:

To appoint Zhordaniy Irakliy Sergeyevich as minister of science, technology, and long-range planning of the Republic of Georgia.

[Signed] **Chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia Z. Gamsakhurdia**
[Dated] Tbilisi, 22 November 1990

DECREE OF THE SUPREME SOVIET OF THE REPUBLIC OF GEORGIA

On the Appointment of F.G. Tkebuchav as Minister of Communications of the Republic of Georgia

The Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia decrees:

To appoint Tkebuchav Feliks Gigoryevich as minister of communications of the Republic of Georgia.

[Signed][begin bold] Chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia Z. Gamsakhurdia[end bold]
[Dated] Tbilisi, 22 November 1990

DECREE OF THE SUPREME SOVIET OF THE REPUBLIC OF GEORGIA

On the Appointment of T.G. Gvelesiani as Minister of Trade of the Republic of Georgia

The Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia decrees:

To appoint Gvelesiani Tamaz Guramovich as minister of trade of the Republic of Georgia.

[Signed][begin bold] Chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia Z. Gamsakhurdia[end bold]
[Dated] Tbilisi, 22 November 1990

DECREE OF THE SUPREME SOVIET OF THE REPUBLIC OF GEORGIA

On the Appointment of G.V. Absandze as Minister of Finance of the Republic of Georgia

The Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia decrees:
To appoint Absandze Guram Valikoyevich as minister of finance of the Republic of Georgia.

[Signed][begin bold] Chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia Z. Gamsakhurdia[end bold]
[Dated] Tbilisi, 22 November 1990

DECREE OF THE SUPREME SOVIET OF THE REPUBLIC OF GEORGIA

On the Appointment of D.M. Khabuliani as Minister of Internal Affairs of the Republic of Georgia

The Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia decrees:
To appoint Khabuliani Dilar Mikhaylovich as minister of internal affairs of the Republic of Georgia.

[Signed]**Chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia Z. Gamsakhurdia**
[Dated] Tbilisi, 22 November 1990

DECREE OF THE SUPREME SOVIET OF THE REPUBLIC OF GEORGIA

On the Appointment of G.M. Khoshtaria as Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Georgia

The Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia decrees:
To appoint Khoshtaria Georgiy Mefodiyevich as minister of foreign affairs of the Republic of Georgia.

[Signed] **Chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia Z. Gamsakhurdia**
[Dated] Tbilisi, 22 November 1990

DECREE OF THE SUPREME SOVIET OF THE REPUBLIC OF GEORGIA

On the Appointment of A.P. Chkheidze as Minister of Transportation of the Republic of Georgia

The Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia decrees:
To appoint Chkheidze Aleksandr Petrovich as minister of transportation of the Republic of Georgia

[Signed]**Chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia Z. Gamsakhurdia**
[Dated] Tbilisi, 22 November 1990

DECREE OF THE SUPREME SOVIET OF THE REPUBLIC OF GEORGIA

On the appointment of I.A. Menagarishvili as Minister of Public Health and Social Security of the Republic of Georgia

The Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia decrees:
To appoint Menagarishvili Irakliy Afinogenovich as minister of public health and social security of the Republic of Georgia.

[Signed] **Chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia Z. Gamsakhurdia**
[Dated] Tbilisi, 22 November 1990

Supreme Soviet Chairman Interviewed on Policy

PM2811153790 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 28 Nov 90 Second Edition p 4

[Interview with Georgian Supreme Soviet Chairman Zviad Gamsakhurdia by special correspondent N. Garifullina, in Tbilisi; date not given: "Where Does This Road Lead? Interview with Georgian Supreme Soviet Chairman Zviad Gamsakhurdia"]

[Text] Tbilisi—By way of introduction to the interview, I will say that attitudes toward the new head of the Supreme Soviet in Georgia are mixed. I was even told that half Georgia loves him fanatically, and half rejects him outright. I have talked with people from both camps. But these are merely opinions. The reality is that Zviad Gamsakhurdia is today the head of the new legislature of a republic that has declared its independence. Its representative at the USSR Supreme Soviet session categorically declared that Georgia will not sign the new Union treaty. On 26 November the Georgian Supreme Soviet reaffirmed its position in a statement to USSR President M.S. Gorbachev. It is easy to guess the position of the chairman himself from all this.

Just who is Zviad Gamsakhurdia? The 51-year-old head of the new legislature is the son of Konstantin Gamsakhurdia, a classic writer of Georgian literature, is brilliantly educated, knows several European languages, and is a poet, translator, and journalist. According to his own admission during our conversation, his road "has been thorny" since he "has struggled against the empire" throughout his life.

Now for the interview. I will not comment on it, in the belief that readers will draw their own conclusions.

[Garifullina] First of all, Batono Zviad, I would like you to tell us what the "roundtable's" platform is.

[Gamsakhurdia] We fought to obtain a decisive edge in the legislature—a decisive majority. We need this in order to implement our political and economic program, which sets the aim of finally liberating Georgia and restoring its state independence. The "roundtable's" platform is based on this. The proclamation of a transitional period and the legal, economic, and political preparation of Georgia for independence.

[Garifullina] Who supports you?

[Gamsakhurdia] The majority of the Georgian people. The majority.

[Garifullina] But who exactly? The intelligentsia? The workers?

[Gamsakhurdia] All, all strata, absolutely all strata of the population. You might say: those who value the ideals of independence and patriotism and who did not sell out to the communists.

[Garifullina] So your "roundtable" espouses anticommunist positions?

[Gamsakhurdia] Yes, yes.

[Garifullina] Then please tell me what path Georgia will take once it has gained its independence.

[Gamsakhurdia] The path of democracy, legislative democracy. The path of economic rebirth and a free market economy.

[Garifullina] Will you maintain relations with Russia, the other Union republics, and the Soviet Union?

[Gamsakhurdia] Without fail! The links will be extremely close, especially the economic links; they cannot be broken, of course, because the republics are traditionally interconnected. It is just that all this must be on a mutually advantageous basis, and the colonial plundering of Georgia must cease. That is the aim of our struggle.

(Clearly, it is appropriate at this point to cite authoritative foreign testimony. On 18 November NEWSWEEK published an article by Carroll Bogert about Georgia which says, in particular: "This dissident turned president knows that, in order to survive, Georgia needs good relations with the Soviet Union. The republic gets 94 percent of its grain, 76 percent of its milk, 40 percent of its meat, and almost all its cheap oil and gas from its northern neighbor. Under the rigid division of labor among the Soviet republics, Georgia has been a producer of citrus fruits, tea, wine, and manganese—which can scarcely be regarded as a balanced diet."—N.G.)

[Garifullina] As a journalist and a human being I am now trying to understand the step that Georgia is now taking under the leadership of the "roundtable" and you yourself. If you look at Georgia's history, it has always sought unification at the hardest times. Take the era of David the Builder [11th-12th century Georgian monarch], whom you so greatly revere. When his father, George II, passed the throne on to him when he was 16 years old, "Kartli was in ruins, nobody was living anywhere except in fortresses, and there were no buildings at all...." That is what the chronicler recounts, and the historic achievement of David Agmashenebeli is precisely that he united the seven kingdoms of Georgia. Other peoples, too, have always fought for Union, maybe because it is easier to endure sorrow, dislocation, and in general any trouble together. Now I think with sorrow: Will a wall arise because of the steps taken by your legislature and will people, will the peoples, cease to communicate with one another?

[Gamsakhurdia] There will be no wall, on the contrary, there will be real friendship. Friendship is possible only between equal peoples, friendship is impossible between servant and master, between slave and master. Georgia is seeking to become an equal state alongside other states, and this will only improve relations between Russia and Georgia, and the national hatred and national strife caused by Georgia's colonial enslavement will cease to exist. Then Russia will be our equal partner, and I think relations will be far better than they are now.

As for David the Builder, you cited a very unfortunate example. David the Builder united Georgia in order to make it independent of invaders. As is well known, imperialist Russia seized and enslaved Georgia. Of course, the Russian people are not to blame for this. The Russian people are themselves victims of imperialism and tyranny.

[Garifullina] You cannot rewrite history, surely? Surely you would not deny that the union with Russia helped Georgia and the Georgians to survive as a nation for two centuries. Remember the many years of exhausting raids on your land by Persia and Turkey. There was great bloodshed, churches were destroyed, the Georgian culture was destroyed. The question then was whether Georgia and the Georgian people would exist or be snuffed out. That was why, if I am correct in my understanding of history, both the Georgian people and the Georgian kings looked to Russia with hope.

[Gamsakhurdia] They looked to Russia, but unfortunately the Russian tsars did not fulfill their commitments to Georgia and instead of a Union they enslaved and destroyed our state.

[Garifullina] Do you totally deny the significance of the Treaty of Georgiyevsk?

[Gamsakhurdia] The Treaty of Georgiyevsk did not envisage enslaving Georgia and depriving it of its statehood. The Treaty of Georgiyevsk envisaged military aid and military cooperation between Georgia and Russia against a common enemy—Islamic imperialism. But the Russian tsars violated the treaty and enslaved Georgia, deprived it of its statehood, and reduced it to colonial status. It is this that we are fighting against, not the Russian people or population.

[Garifullina] But it was under this Union that the Georgian people endured and survived.

[Gamsakhurdia] What? They endured and suffered genocide worse than anything during Turkish and Persian times. You simply do not know the figures for Georgia's losses during the years it has been part of the Soviet empire. It has suffered awful losses. Especially during the Soviet time. The repressions cost the lives of hundreds of thousands of people. The war cost the lives of 600,000 Georgians—proportionately speaking, no republic suffered such heavy losses as Georgia. The

growth of the non-Georgian population is faster than that of the Georgian population. We have figures to prove this.

[Garifullina] But Russia's losses during the Great Patriotic War were very heavy....

[Gamsakhurdia] Well okay. But Georgia's losses were proportionately greater. Six hundred thousand people is more to little Georgia than 20 million to Russia.

[Garifullina] Do you believe that Georgia is still a colony nowadays?

[Gamsakhurdia] Of course! It does not have its own state.

[Garifullina] But Georgia is a Union republic, one of the 15 equal republics in the Union. So who is oppressing and enslaving whom?

[Gamsakhurdia] That is purely formal. No republic can exist when the state has no independent government, independent Army, independent Navy, independent money and banking system, and independent economy. You are an educated person, you know all that. How can Georgia be regarded as a state when it lacks those things?

[Garifullina] So your legislature's next step will be to create its own Army....

[Gamsakhurdia] Of course! The restoration of statehood in all spheres.

[Garifullina] All the same the path that Georgia is now taking—the path toward separation, toward secession from the Soviet Union—will clearly not be supported by everyone even in Georgia itself. What do you think?

[Gamsakhurdia] The majority supports it! The majority of our people supports independence.

[Garifullina] What is to become of the people who do not share your position? What is to become of autonomous formations and ethnic minorities?

[Gamsakhurdia] They will eventually realize that this is the only possible way of saving our people and our country.

[Garifullina] Is anyone threatening it?

[Gamsakhurdia] Of course there are threats. A great many dangers threaten our people.

[Garifullina] Could you tell me about them in more detail?

[Gamsakhurdia] The system is a threat, the communist system above all. The venal government and venal functionaries who sold our country and our people, actually sold Georgian soil bit by bit to the non-Georgian population. The non-Georgian population is multiplying at a catastrophic rate, and our people may find themselves a minority in their own land in the very near future. Georgia's environment is being destroyed and ecological disaster is approaching thanks to this ownerlessness, anarchy, and disarray. The state of the economy is awful. There is total economic disarray. The people are in need, social and economic need. All this is a threat to our country. Only reforms, only changes in these spheres can help.

[Garifullina] How do you envision Georgia's state and social system?

[Gamsakhurdia] As democratic. The system will be democratic.

[Garifullina] Forms of ownership constitute the foundation of any system.

[Gamsakhurdia] All forms of ownership will be legalized. There will be no discrimination in this sphere.

[Garifullina] Does this mean that you are totally abandoning all the institutions of power and social institutions created during the years of Soviet power?

[Gamsakhurdia] Yes, these monstrous institutions have been the ruin of Georgia and have brought it to the verge of disaster. It is a bureaucratic system, a system of central planning in the economy—all this has had a pernicious effect on Georgia. We are going to change all this.

[Garifullina] How?

[Gamsakhurdia] By dismantling these structures and creating new structures of power and economic management.

[Garifullina] What are your relations with the Communist Party like?

[Gamsakhurdia] We have a very negative attitude toward the Communist Party, because it is to blame for all the Georgian people's calamities and misfortunes in recent times, particularly the carnage of 9 April.

[Garifullina] In terms of number of seats, the Communist Party is in second place after the "roundtable" in legislature. Are you going to cooperate?

[Gamsakhurdia] That depends on them, on how they behave. Unless they abandon old stereotypes, there will be confrontation.

[Garifullina] Georgia's ethnic makeup is heterogeneous. What policy will your legislature pursue regarding the non-Georgian section of the population?

[Gamsakhurdia] A policy of equality for all nations and nationalities, without granting privileges. In most cases the non-Georgian population is still privileged, and the indigenous nation suffers discrimination, persecution, and oppression in almost all regions. We want to establish equality and, of course, to protect the rights of small ethnic minorities so there is no ethnic strife, there are no ethnic conflicts, and everyone lives in harmony and equality.

[Garifullina] You started out as the creator of the Helsinki Union, which, as is well known, advocates equal rights. But you said that the "roundtable" is fighting against the communist course.

[Gamsakhurdia] Yes.

[Garifullina] So, if I have understood you correctly, communists will begin to be persecuted for their political convictions?

[Gamsakhurdia] No. Certainly not. Only for crimes. No one will persecute them for their convictions. If they continue their criminal practices against the Georgian people, then they will be stopped and punished, so to speak. Not only the communists.

[Garifullina] What crimes has the Communist Party committed against the Georgian people?

[Gamsakhurdia] It has sold, its functionaries have sold, Georgian lands to non-Georgians. A very sizable proportion.

[Garifullina] Do you believe that the Communist Party did this or specific people?

[Gamsakhurdia] Specific people, but the party turned a blind eye to it.

[Garifullina] That is certainly hard to imagine.

[Gamsakhurdia] Unfortunately it is true. It is this that we regard as impermissible, not the communist ideology. Then the practice of the destruction of the environment gained terrible scope.

[Garifullina] But environmental disasters have nothing to do with ideology. Rather, they are a consequence of urbanization and the scientific and technical revolution. In any highly developed country, unfortunately....

[Gamsakhurdia] Yes, but they had the power, and they used this power to destroy our environment. We believe that this was done deliberately.

[Garifullina] Batono Zviad, I know I am not going to change your mind about anything because you have your own world outlook. All the same, in human terms I feel sorrow that Georgia is breaking away. I keep on thinking: Is the border going to be closed?

[Gamsakhurdia] Nothing is going to be closed. You know how Switzerland and France are neighbors. Anyone can cross the border, but there is a particular form, a procedure for this. We simply cannot allow the population of other republics to freely settle here, you know. That is what we are opposed to. We always cordially receive visitors, everybody, but people are coming from all republics and settling in Georgia, acquiring land, and building houses. There are no controls here, you see? This threatens us with destruction.

[Garifullina] Do you know that Georgians, too, live in other republics?

[Gamsakhurdia] We are opposed to this. We are opposed to the uncontrolled migration of Georgians to all oblasts. We will also halt this without fail.

[Garifullina] Will you bring them back home?

[Gamsakhurdia] Probably. We will do our utmost. And we will impede migration, because it threatens our nation. Do you know what has caused our concern? The Soviet empire set the goal of mixing all the peoples and making a conglomerate, of destroying nations altogether. We are opposed to that.

[Garifullina] But that goal never existed.

[Gamsakhurdia] It exists, and people wrote about it openly. There was a campaign in the press. Prof. Rybakovskiy, Kaldikhchiani, and others openly urged that all nations be mixed up together, that republics be destroyed, and that a single Soviet people be produced—who knows who they would be, what nation they would belong to, and what language and traditions they would have. We are opposed to this. You must understand us clearly.

[Garifullina] But a press campaign is just a campaign, not an official policy. Incidentally, the Communist Party, too, is opposed to this. Its goal is an ethnic renaissance and the revival of national languages, cultures, and traditions.

[Gamsakhurdia] I beg to differ!

[Garifullina] But it is true. Okay, you have made your choice, and if it brings happiness to the Georgian people and prosperity to your land, then good luck, as the saying goes! May that all come to pass. But our great country could indeed become beautiful if we all worked together on this idea today.

[Gamsakhurdia] It will not happen. We must put into practice what the country's anthem says. This must be an inviolable union of free republics, not of slaves, you know, and not of free [as published] republics. This must be done, and I assure you that free Russia and free Georgia will cooperate better and be better friends than is the case in the present situation.

In general, the most important point I am making is that real friendship between peoples can exist only when they are sovereign and independent. Russia is now traveling precisely this path. Yeltsin and the new Russia are traveling the path of sovereignty and independence. We welcome this and will certainly have the closest of relations with that Russia.

[Garifullina] But not with a communist Russia?

[Gamsakhurdia] Not with a communist Russia. We want relations with a democratic Russia.

[Garifullina] What if Russia remains Soviet despite everything?

[Gamsakhurdia] I do not think it will remain Soviet. The future no longer belongs to communism.

[Garifullina] But tell me then why in all periods, in all centuries, the best people have been burned alive, hanged, or executed for the sake of the ideas of equality, fraternity, and freedom? You say that the future does not belong to the communist idea and communism. But how do you explain the paradox: Attempts have been made to finish off these ideas, some people have repudiated them, and today they are being defamed, mocked, and ostracized, yet they are still alive and hold sway over people's minds and hearts. Why?

[Gamsakhurdia] Yes, but they have not been implemented in reality. What was implemented in reality was the total opposite. Moreover, this ideology has no God, no religion. So it is doomed to destruction, collapse, and failure. No society that is not based on a religious ideology and that rejects the idea of God will be successful. That is why atheist communism is doomed. The supreme idea is the idea of God. That is my opinion and the opinion of the greatest representatives of literature and philosophy.

[Garifullina] Let us turn to history once again. The name of God was used to sanctify the crusades and other extremely bloody wars. There are charges to be leveled against the church, too, and considerable ones. Yes, mistakes were made in building our society, but now, you know, society has come to realize that the lack of spirituality and the destruction of churches have led to the degradation of morality. Many mistakes, including this one, are now being rectified.

[Gamsakhurdia] If all this is rectified, if all this improves, then this ideology will perhaps be saved, otherwise there is no chance of that.

[Garifullina] In the movie "Repentance" the great Veriko Andzhaparidze says something that has now become a catchphrase: "What is the point of a road if it does not lead to the temple."

[Gamsakhurdia] That was said of communism. That was said of the communist ideology, which does not lead to the temple. You can see for yourself what it leads to.

[Garifullina] And your path, the path onto which you are now steering Georgia, does lead to the temple?

[Gamsakhurdia] Of course it does.

[Garifullina] Are you sure?

[Gamsakhurdia] Naturally. Because it is based on the Christian religion and the Christian way.

[Garifullina] Well, thank you for the interview!

National Congress Organizational Collegium Meets

91US0128B Tbilisi MOLODEZH GRUZII in Russian 9 Nov 90 p 2

[Unattributed report: "Session of the Organizational Collegium of the National Congress"]

[Text] On 6 November 1990, a regular session of the Organizational Collegium of the National Congress was convened. G. Gogbaidze presided.

Those in attendance greeted the appearance of Collegium member G. Chanturiya with satisfaction and wished him full recovery following the incident in which he was wounded.

I. Khaindrava presented a report on the work accomplished by the editorial board. He noted that all documents ratified by the congress and the Organizational Collegium had undergone final drafting and been published. Regarding the Appeal to Peoples of the World, it was considered advisable to distribute this to each member of the Organizational Collegium, so as to draw up a final version. Each member of the Collegium had received a copy by the end of the meeting.

V. Mtavrishvili and M. Kurdiani provided information on the situation that has developed concerning the fund of the Georgian Demographic Society and the arrest of I. Begiashvili, a member of this society. As a result of timely intervention on the part of members of the congress, Begiashvili was able to be released on bail, an event that was favorably received. G. Gogbaidze was directed to form and head a commission to study the situation surrounding the Demographic Society fund and present a report to the congress. G. Tvalavadze and S. Machavariani were made members of the commission. It was considered advisable to propose the participation of representatives of all interested parties in the work of the commission.

I. Tsereteli addressed the session. He noted that the question of mutual relations with the newly elected Supreme Soviet would depend to a great extent on how it defined the present status of Georgia and its own status. If the Supreme Soviet decision on this issue coincides with the point of view of the National Congress, this will facilitate mutual understanding between the two organs. I. Tsereteli also touched on the basic trends of future activity of the congress.

Members of the Organizational Collegium heard information provided by Z. Gablishvili on the necessity of sending Z. Kasrashvili and I. Rukhadze, poisoned during the events of 9 April 1989, to medical centers in the West for urgent treatment. Their lives are in danger, but the necessary funds have still not been found from official sources. The National Congress does not have such financial capability at its disposal, and, therefore, it appeals to all organizations, institutions, and private

individuals requesting they provide what assistance they are able to muster for the victims of 9 April.

G. Chanturiya presented a draft version of the Appeal to Influential Sociopolitical Organizations of the West, organizations that might assist in validating the Georgian National Congress in the international arena and provide it moral and material support. The text of the appeal was approved.

There was continued discussion and examination of the question of structure and operating regime of the National Congress as proposed by the National Democratic Party. An alternative draft of the Georgian People's Party was introduced by G. Sikharulidze. Parties, organizations, and all interested members of the congress were invited to present their observations at the next session of the Organizational Collegium.

Session participants focused attention on the problem of establishing the solid economic base necessary for successful activity of the congress. T. Kvachantiradze and I. Batiashvili shared their thoughts on this issue. The latter was invited to present a draft resolution on the problem.

Members of the Organizational Collegium unanimously approved the idea of establishing under the congress a council in which those parties, organizations, and public figures that did not participate in elections to the National Congress could take part. This question will be presented for confirmation by the congress at the next session.

N. Tsiskadze informed those in attendance concerning the functions and future activity of the recently established "Rescue Corps." A discussion took place. The question will be discussed in detail in the future. In as much as it does not appear possible to create today in Georgia national military formations that would be completely independent from the Union military establishment, and since there are no guarantees these would not be used against the will of the people, it is considered advisable to continue the boycott of the occupation army.

The next session of the Organizational Collegium of the National Congress is set for 1200, 9 November 1990. I. Kadagishvili has been elected chairman. An agenda has been confirmed.

National Congressmen Discuss Supreme Soviet Ties

91US0130B Tbilisi ZARYA VOSTOKA in Russian 17 Nov 90 p 3

[Article by Eka Akhalkatsi: "Congressmen—On the Georgian Supreme Soviet"]

[Text] The session of the National Congress was not convened on 16 November as scheduled. It was moved back to the 30th of the month in view of the absence of more than 50 Congressmen in Tbilisi, participating in reburying the remains of the last tsar, Imereti Solomon II. The session will be conducted at the headquarters of the Georgian National Independence Party (29 Rustaveli Prospekt, Tbilisi).

...The attention of all inhabitants of Georgia is riveted these days on the work of the new Supreme Soviet, which on the first day of its session has already confidently begun to draw up the principles for restoration of the state independence of the republic. It cannot be otherwise—hardly anyone doubts that Georgia has made the correct choice.

Letters coming into ZARYA VOSTOKA testify to the fact that many people are troubled by the relationship between the Supreme Soviet and National Congress—how are they being constituted? Is there danger of confrontation between these two elected bodies?

"We are ready to cooperate with any force which will do even the slightest good for Georgia, and we welcome every initiative which is useful to Georgia or serves its interests, regardless of whose it is," Zviad Gamsakhurdia stated recently in response to a question on cooperation between the Supreme Soviet and the Congress.

And what do the Congressmen think? As we know, cooperation and accord were envisioned, and not confrontation and struggle. According to the words of Georgian National-Democratic Party leader Chanturia, confrontation will become possible only in the event the Supreme Soviet: 1—concludes a new "Union" treaty; 2—announces a declaration on "independence"; 3—begins to engage in terror or repression, begins to confront the National Congress or the entire national movement; 4—fails to fight for deoccupation; 5—sets out on an undemocratic course not taking into account the interests of Georgia and the Georgian nation.

In the event the Supreme Soviet—independent from its official status, a factor considered by Gia Chanturia as a reason this organ cannot be termed a legislature under conditions of occupation—is able to defend the interests of the Georgian nation and pursue a democratic policy, then Chanturia is certain there will be no obstacle to future official contacts between these two organs, and if necessary the Supreme Soviet of the Georgian Republic will be provided assistance and support by the National Congress.

The first two questions, judging from events of recent days, were dropped from the agenda. As far as the rest are concerned, we will hope that there will be no confrontation.

Irakliy Tsereteli, chairman of the Georgian National Independence Party (union) reasons thus: The election of the National Congress through universal, unofficial, non-soviet elections means that the people have handed over to it the functions of leader and coordinating center for the Georgian national-liberation movement. But the election—also through democratic means—of the

Supreme Soviet has put Georgia in a difficult position. Insofar as the republic is occupied, and the illegality of its present official status is demonstrated by the Georgian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet resolution of 9 March 1990, the 28 October elections of Georgia's highest organ of state power are, from the legal and judicial points of view as well as for political reasons, invalid. The Law on Elections has determined the Georgian Supreme Soviet to be the highest organ of state power in the republic—which does not conform to reality, since such status may be claimed only by a parliament whose elections are conducted on the basis of the Constituent Assembly of the Georgian Constitution adopted in 1921, and not on the basis of a law of any other state, especially a law adopted in the Georgian SSR. The elections of the state power of Georgia by the Georgian SSR Supreme Soviet are inadmissible. Such elections could be appointed by a temporary coalition government of the transition period. But under the best conditions, they would be set up on the basis of a Law on Extraordinary, Universal, Democratic, Multiparty Elections, adopted by a Constituent Assembly restored through a specially enacted law. And not under conditions of occupation, annexation, or aggression—i.e., only in a situation in which it becomes possible to extend the validity of the Georgian Constitution adopted in 1921. But insofar as elections to the Supreme Soviet were conducted nonetheless and took place in accordance with democratic principles—i.e., were free and multiparty in nature, and those organizations came to power which had always occupied a leading position in the overall national-liberation movement of the republic—Irakliy Tsereteli declares in the name of his party that cooperation is necessary: necessary for the future of Georgia, for the future of the nation. In order for the further political cooperation of these two organs to be fruitful, in the view of members of the republic's National Independence Party, the Georgian Republic Supreme Soviet must take the following measures: 1—recognize Georgia as being occupied, annexed, existing under conditions of aggression by a colonial country; 2—raise the question before the colonial power [metropoliya] and international organizations of immediate deoccupation, decolonialization, and the reemergence of independent statehood for Georgia; 3—adopt a special decree according to which implementation of the USSR Constitution in the territory of Georgia is suspended; 4—adopt a decree on elimination of the Georgian SSR; 5—render assistance to the National Congress in the matter of preparation for universal national insubordination.

In the view of I. Tsereteli, confrontation will become possible in the event the Supreme Soviet rejects the political measures enumerated. Nonetheless, he recognizes the necessity (prior to declaration of universal national insubordination) of cooperation between the Supreme Soviet and the National Congress during the transition period in the economic, social, cultural, demographic, ecological, national security, and defense spheres.

Prime Minister Sigua Comments on Economic Reform

91US0135A Tbilisi ZARYA VOSTOKA in Russian 16 Nov 90 p 3

[Speech by Tengiz Sigua, chairman of the Republic of Georgia Council of Ministers, at the first session of the Republic of Georgia Supreme Soviet; date not given]

[Text] Esteemed members of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia! Ladies and gentlemen!

At this truly historic time for the fate of Georgia, a multi-party legislature elected in a democratic manner charges the newly formed government with an immense and lofty task: An independently operating national economy should become a material foundation to ensure the complete political and territorial sovereignty of Georgia. Unfortunately, as of now we do not have such an economy. At the same time, due to the peculiarities of the economy, the process of its emergence is going to take more time than the formation of new political structures. The first day of the proceedings of our legislature showed that, despite sociopolitical processes developing quite painfully, Georgia is steadily and persistently approaching a higher objective—the restoration of an independent statehood. For the above reason, at the same time, the profound economic and social crisis is worsening to the extreme in an environment of the continuous destruction of the Soviet system.

An economic organism based on ignoring economic interests and on directive management has failed to assimilate internally the elements of liberalization and has finally lost dynamism and its ability to develop in recent years, in an environment of the unsystematic introduction of so-called radical economic reforms. A dangerous tendency to wind down production and reduce labor productivity has clearly emerged. Last year, the level of output of industrial and agricultural products, and the generation of national income, declined considerably. According to official statistics, this crisis phenomenon will grow even worse this year. In the nine months of this year, compared to statistics for last year, the national income produced dropped by five percent, and the output of industrial products by six percent; the level of productivity of social labor declined by three percent. Retrogression clearly affected animal husbandry; a decline in the number of cattle and poultry continued. The supply of meat and milk products, vegetables, fruits, potatoes, and other foodstuffs deteriorated abruptly. Disorganization affected the market of manufactured goods, prices kept growing, and the rate of inflation was up. According to available estimates, the monetary resources the population has on hand exceed the volume of the republic's state budget by almost a factor of three to four, and exceed the annual national income by more than a factor of 1.5. A substantial segment of enterprises and organizations of industry, construction, and other economic sectors are on the

brink of bankruptcy. Their overdue debt reaches R3.2 billion [rubles], exceeding last year's statistic by approximately R400 million.

These processes are a consequence of the strained sociopolitical situation to a lesser degree than they are a consequence of the inner unsoundness of the Soviet economic system which exists to this day. Despite the contemporary scientific-technical revolution and extremely abundant natural and labor resources, this system has not succeeded in organizing production at a level worthy of a civilized society and creating an appropriate standard of living. Gigantic and cumbersome economic structures which are referred to as the unified national economic complex have extremely weakened the ability of the economies of Union republics to function autonomously.

Let us look, for example, at our republic which still does not have a stable and reliable fuel and energy base. Our own production of electricity is three to four billion kilowatt-hours less than our needs. This is happening at a time when our current requirements are considerably inferior to the average statistics of more or less developed countries because of the poor standard of production and of domestic technical equipment. In addition, our power industry is based on resources which are shipped in, due to restricted reserves and insufficient prospecting of our own oil and coal deposits.

Georgia's agro-industrial complex, based on our highly favorable natural and soil-climatic conditions, is marked by much greater originality compared to other sectors. However, by virtue of the infamous all-Union division of labor and as a result of lopsided specialization, its specialty at present is to generate products the market for which is now virtually restricted to the USSR because of their quality. At the same time, the preferential development of the above sectors has excessively constrained and virtually crowded out the production of grains and, accordingly, the output of animal husbandry, which has made our food supply dependent on other regions.

Our difficulties are due not only to decades of purposeful deformations in the economic structure. Immeasurable losses have been inflicted on us by divorcing us from the world market, by the inefficient use of our own raw-material resources—manganese and non-ferrous metals—and the inefficient use of our unique conditions for resort and tourist developments inside the Soviet Union. The same may be said about the development of the Black Sea and the progress of sea navigation in keeping with the interests of the republic. This enumeration may be continued. In short, it is quite evident that until the economy of Georgia gets rid of these structures the failures of Russia and other republics which are now occurring will interfere with the progress of the economy of Georgia. A reliable and strong economic foundation for our unquestionable political achievements will appear when we accomplish this task.

Representatives of political parties and organizations belonging to the "Round Table-Free Georgia" bloc account for a majority of the deputies in the Supreme Soviet of Georgia. This bloc has an extensive platform for solving the aforementioned problems. Its implementation is a priority, vital task of the new government of the republic. Besides, we must say that in recent years a renaissance of economic thinking has clearly occurred in Georgia. I think that in accomplishing specific economic tasks we will be able to draw for many things on the programs of other parties in order to overcome the difficult legacy which we are now receiving from our predecessors.

At the same time, we take into account the fact that the essence of the economic independence of Georgia is not expressed in the export-import balance we have with Russia or some other country, but rather in the degree to which we are capable of changing existing economic relations with them in conjunction with economic, political, and, if you will, moral factors. Of course, in an environment of the contemporary scientific-technical revolution, when economic life becomes international in nature, the existence of states with closed economies, especially those the size of Georgia, is inconceivable; certainly, we will not strive for this. The main point is to have economic and financial opportunities which will make it possible to replace one source with another, to switch from one market for sales to another.

Unfortunately, at present opportunities for such maneuvering are limited in a situation which is critical for our economy. According to the data of the Georgian Ministry of Finance, not even half the needs of the expenditure side of our state budget for next year are met by current sources of revenue; the deficit exceeds R4 billion. This situation has developed to a considerable degree because the government of the Soviet Union deigned to shift a large segment of the burden of economic difficulties to the republics. When procurement prices for grains and products of animal husbandry increased, the instruction was to cover the difference in prices from the republic budgets rather than the Union budget. Expenditures associated with increases in retirement benefits and so on also went up. Due to these and other measures, the difficulties of our republic in striving for independence have deteriorated further.

Under the circumstances, the new government of the republic will have to take emergency measures to ensure the continuous operation of the economy in a period of transition, as well as the preservation of its viability, along with the development and implementation of a long-range strategic economic program. This means priority supplies of foodstuffs and national-economic resources to the populace, first of all those of fuels and energy. This is an extremely difficult task in a period of reducing centralized distribution to a minimum and switching to direct contacts, when Soviet currency depreciates from one day to the next and when republic hard currency expenditures are extremely small.

This is not at all to say that our affairs are in the worst possible state, however, and the center can force us to stray from our path through starvation and cold. The point is that the economy of Russia depends on our economy just as we are tied to the Russian economy. If it refuses to deliver energy and raw-material resources to us, it will be forced to look for markets for the products of its manufacturing industry, which are not exactly high-quality, and secure hard currency resources for acquiring in return for these products our wines, tea, fruits, vegetables, citruses, canned goods, and so on. This is why both we and the Soviet Union are forced to maintain existing economic ties, though it is necessary to seek alternatives to these ties as soon as possible.

Therefore, in 1991 we will have to agree to economic cooperation with the center. It is not ruled out that this cooperation will be in the form of a unified plan or, which is more desirable, an economic agreement.

At the same time, persistent implementation of the economic platform of the "Round Table-Free Georgia" bloc will be the main avenue of government economic activities. The first steps in this direction should be taken through adopting legislative acts on property, land use, entrepreneurship, a banking system, and others. We will work out and implement a program of decentralizing and privatizing state property in the course of purposefully pursuing a policy of economic liberalization in such a manner that free entrepreneurship and the development of private initiative will become the way of our economic life. We should view entering the international market and attracting foreign capital in keeping with the political and economic interests of Georgia as being of decisive significance...

In addition to this, ensuring social protection for the populace will be one of the main concerns of the government.

We should state straightforwardly that the attainment of political and economic independence is occurring under conditions which are extremely unfavorable for us. Unfortunately, in view of this we will not be able to avoid difficulties in the social sphere during a period of transition. Liberalizing prices will further complicate the life of certain strata of the population whose life is hard to begin with. We will not avoid unemployment either. The Georgian Government will take all measures for these processes to develop with as little pain for the populace as possible, however. At the same time, the sooner we go through a period of transition which is fraught with social difficulties—this in itself requires that such processes be speeded up—the sooner we will create political and economic prerequisites for attaining Western standards of living.

Simultaneously with changes in the economic system, the government considers it its duty to create more favorable conditions for eliminating structural deformations in the Georgian national economy and to provide incentives for the preferential development of industries which ensure the creation of a reliable and guaranteed foodstuffs and energy base, our main asset, and possibly for the more efficient use of unique natural resources and the potential of highly intellectual labor. From this point of view, scientific-technical progress, the development of basic sciences, and the accelerated development of research-intensive industries which require skilled labor resources—electronics, the radio equipment industry, and others—should be a special concern of the government. Machine building in Georgia should gravitate toward producing machinery and equipment which first of all meet the needs of its own economy, the agroindustrial complex, and particularly farming in mountainous areas.

The metallurgical and chemical industries should be developed, with their orientation being mostly toward using local raw material resources as much as possible and manufacturing final products.

By virtue of the nature of Georgia, blessed by God, agriculture and food processing are the foundation of its economy. The implementation of an agrarian reform should proceed from the traditions of the Georgian people and considerations of economic expediency because preserving and restoring our rural areas will ensure the economic reinforcement of the agroindustrial complex and its entry to the international market.

The issues of developing our transportation system, particularly highways, and turning Georgia into a truly maritime country are the foremost among long-range economic issues. A great effort should be made to develop highly profitable resort and tourist facilities and services.

Despite difficulties during a period of transition, the government's social policy cannot be restricted to measures aimed at maintaining the attained standard of living. The systems of culture, education, and health care should be persistently and steadfastly cleansed of the still lingering "socialist" stereotypes.

From this point of view, we should search for sources of investment in these vital spheres, no matter how great our financial difficulties may be. Large-scale training of cadres mastering modern Western technologies and management techniques appears to be a particularly significant problem.

Along with this, all current operations and strategic measures implemented in the economic sphere should be carried out in the interest of accomplishing priority tasks to improve the natural environment. Ecological requirements should be a criterion in the course of solving all economic problems. No project, no matter how highly effective, should be carried out without regard for the ecology.

Such are the main highlights of the activity of the new government of Georgia in a period of transition. The development of specific programs aimed at solving the above problems and the submission to the legislature of draft legislative documents substantiated from the scientific, technical, and economic points of view will begin immediately after the government is formed.